DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 702 TM 870 119

AUTHOR	Gottfredson, Denise C.; And Others
TITLE	School Climate Assessment Instruments: A Review.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jul 86
NOTE	255p.; An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986). Small print in Tables 5 through 8.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Measures; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Measurement Techniques; Psychometrics; Questionnaires; Rating Scales; *School Effectiveness; Surveys; *Test Reliability; *Test Reviews; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS	Test Content

ABSTRACT

In order to collect the necessary information on various practices and devices used in school climate assessment, 22 of the 39 school improvement projects mentioned in the Miles and Kaufman directory of effective schools programs were selected for a survey. A questionnaire was used to collect the primary data. Each program was asked for copies of the climate assessment devices used in the project. The 22 projects used a total of 82 instruments. Each project used 1-12 instruments with a mean number of 3.8 per project. Every project surveyed teachers, 14 surveyed administrators, 9 surveyed other school staff, 12 surveyed parents, and 12 projects asked students about their perceptions of the school. This report summarizes the content of the item groupings in the projects' assessments, general characteristics of the instruments, utility of the information yielded, and the psychometric properties of the instruments used by the programs. Twenty instruments in 11 projects met the criterion of face validity, and their characteristics, including costs, are described in more detail. It is concluded that while reliable, valid, practical measures of dimensions of school organization and composition exist, they exist amidst an ocean of measures whose characteristics are unknown. Appendix A provides summaries of all the school climate assessment instruments with the following information: instrument title and project number, author(s), institution, availability, intended purpose, reliability information, validity information, scoring, content, strengths and weaknesses, and general comments. The study's data collection form and the coding scheme used to code scale content are also appended. (JAZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278702

School Climate Assessment Instruments: A Review

Denise C. Gottfredson

Lois G. Hybl

Gary D. Gottfredson

and

Renee P. Castaneda

Center for Social Organization of Schools

The Johns Hopkins University

July 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Gottfredson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

TM 870 119

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School Climate Assessment Instruments: A Review

School assessment is an integral part of school improvement. Of 39 projects described in a recent directory of school improvement projects (Miles & Kaufman, 1985), 27 used school assessment instruments to guide program planning or to evaluate their school improvement efforts. Innovative state education laws also encourage the use of school assessment. For example, South Carolina's Educational Improvement Act requires schools to plan locally for school improvement and to file annual accountability reports documenting their progress on several effective schools criteria.

The recent wave of enthusiasm for school improvement created jointly by the effective schools phenomenon and recent calls for school reform has caught educational researchers unprepared to meet the demand for practical assessment tools. Consequently, school system personnel and educational researchers around the country have been working independently and simultaneously on the task of locating or developing school assessment devices. The result is an array of instruments that cover different areas and have unexamined psychometric properties, formats, and reporting procedures.

A recent discussion of the state of the art in school assessment (Rowan, 1985) emphasized that the science of school assessment is in its infancy. Little consensus exists on what dimensions of schools should be assessed,

---

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1986. Preparation of this report was supported in part by a grant from the Office for Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office. We gratefully acknowledge the help of the many people who provided the information that made this review possible.

which members of the school community should be assessed over what time period, and what standards should be applied in interpreting the assessment data. Psychometric properties of assessment instruments (i.e., their validity and reliability) are often unexamined by users of these instruments.

This paper seeks to provide useful information about current school assessment practices. We describe and compare several instruments recently used by school improvement projects to guide educators selecting school assessment instruments and to help researchers identify areas in which research will be most helpful.

Methods

Sample

The sample study includes 22 of the 39 school improvement projects described in a recent directory of effective schools projects (Miles & Kaufman, 1985). The 39 projects included in the directory, according to Miles and Kaufman, represent the majority of effective schools programs that met the following criteria:

1. Were grounded in a base of research knowledge, mainly about effective schools but also about effective teaching.
2. Had an emphasis on change at the building level.
3. Were operating during the 1984-85 school year.
4. Were implemented for at least one full school year, in more than one school.
5. Had clear, well-developed procedures, embodied in supportive materials.
6. Had adequate provision for data collection and analysis as a basis for school self-diagnosis and planning.
7. Had adequate provision for supportive training and consultation, including follow-up.
8. Had staff members with active interests in diffusing the program to other users beyond their school, district or state.
9. Supplied names of specific current users of the program who could respond to inquiries from potential new users.

Several programs that did not meet one or more of the above criteria or were clones or near clones of other existing programs were not included in the directory.

We excluded ten of the 39 projects in the Miles and Kaufman directory from our study because, according to the directory, they did not use school climate assessment instruments or they used an instrument that was used in another project in the directory. From the 29 remaining projects we requested copies of the climate assessment devices used in the project, directions for scoring them, samples of how the information from the assessment was summarized, technical manuals, instructions for administering the device and interpreting the resulting information, and information about the psychometric properties of the measures.

Twenty-eight of the 29 projects responded. Of these, one project was excluded because its instruments were developed for a specific, narrow purpose and were not of general interest as climate assessment tools. Three more were excluded because they did not use an assessment tool consistently. Another was excluded because its climate assessment device was no longer available, and a final project was excluded because it used the same device as another of the projects in our sample. Table 3 lists the names of the 22 remaining projects. Appendix A provides the project names and numbers from the Miles and Kaufman directory, names and addresses of contact persons, and descriptions of the instruments used.

Many of these projects used multiple assessment instruments. We selected only those devices that were intended to measure school climate (broadly defined), and eliminated assessment instruments that were used to gather information from archival records (attendance, grades, achievement test scores, etc.). For each instrument, we used the device in Appendix B to code information about its intended respondents, sampling techniques, uses, time to complete, cost, content, and information about psychometric properties.

The instruments proved difficult to code. All four authors independently coded a randomly selected subset of the instruments to determine the extent to which we agreed on the coding. There was substantial divergence in our coding of several of the items. For one instrument the four coders recorded four different instrument names! We decided to collaboratively code the instruments, resolving any discrepancies through discussion. As in any task involving human judgment, other specialists might have produced somewhat different patterns of detailed results. We are confident, however, that the broad patterns resulting from our examination of these instruments provide a useful summary of assessment practices.

Results

The 22 projects used a total of 82 instruments. Of these, 8 were clones of other instruments, and four were classroom observation instruments to assess time use. We excluded these, leaving 70 instruments. Projects used from one to twelve instruments. The mean number of instruments per project was 3.8, but the modal number was 1.

Data Collection Techniques and Respondents

The primary data collection technique used in the 22 projects was a self-administered questionnaire. All but one of the projects used at least one questionnaire. One used interviews only, and five used questionnaires and interviews.

Twenty projects assessed elementary schools, 12 assessed high schools, and 18 assessed middle or junior highs.

Teachers were the primary source of assessment information. Every project surveyed teachers, 14 surveyed administrators, 9 surveyed other school staff, and 12 surveyed parents. Only about half of the projects (12) asked students--the primary consumers of education--about their perceptions of the school.

Contents

Table 1 shows the contents of the item groupings included in the projects' assessments. It shows which school characteristics were purportedly assessed by the 70 instruments included in our study. This table is based on the names of the scales or item groupings included in the assessments. It was constructed without regard to the quality of the measurement.

Table 1 shows that about eighty percent of the scales or item groupings measured characteristics commonly included in lists associated with the effective school movement.[1] About twenty percent of the "effective schools" measures covered more than one of these characteristics. Of those that we were able to code into a unique category (using the coding scheme in Appendix C), the most frequently measured characteristics were Clear Goals/High Expectations, Order and Discipline, Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, Collaborative Planning/Collegial Relationships, Parental Involvement and Support, Maximized Learning Time, and Instructional Leadership.

---

[1] These categories are primarily taken from Purkey and Smith (1983). "Frequent Monitoring" is described in Edmonds (1979) and the "Effective Instruction Category" includes characteristics of effective instruction identified in the literature (Good & Grouws, 1979; Rosenshine, 1976) but not explicitly addressed in the "effective schools literature." It included questioning strategies, teacher-led instruction, teacher practices to ensure high success rates, student participation, and explicit criteria for evaluating student progress.

Many instruments assessed dimensions with labels other than those typically found in the lists of effective schools characteristics. Many of these other climate dimensions are summarized in Table 8 and will be discussed shortly.

Ease of Use, Utility of Information Yielded

Table 2 shows some general characteristics of the 70 instruments. It shows that most provided little guidance for administering the instruments and interpreting their results--materials for between 18 and 36 percent of the instruments included such guidance. When we limited the analysis to those 30 instruments that appeared to be intended for general use (rather than for specific projects) the percentage of instruments accompanied by such assistance increased, but was still low. Even among these "general use" instruments, only 31% provided recommendations for sampling, 37% instructions for administration, and 50% guidance in interpretation.

The assessment results were usually presented as raw school item means and frequencies. Sometimes groups of items were averaged and the means or average percent responding favorably were also presented. Almost half (45%) of the instruments were summarized in profiles showing relative elevations for different dimensions, and about a third also provided a narrative summary.

Other forms of feedback were rare: Results from three of the 70 instruments were presented as percentile ranks relative to other schools, and results from six were presented as differences between actual and desired or expected conditions. About 20% of the instruments (9) were used to measure change over time, and 15% (9) and 7% (4) compared the school's results with other schools in a local or national sample, respectively.

Psychometric Properties

In examining the psychometric properties of these instruments, we used the scale or item-group rather than the instrument as the unit of analysis. Some instruments did not have identifiable item groupings--they were simply lists of questions. Other instruments did have discrete item groupings, but we were unable to obtain information about which items were scored with which group. A few authors refused to show us their instruments. Dashes in the rightmost column of Table 3 indicate the five projects entirely excluded from our analysis of scale properties for reasons cited above. One or more instruments from three other projects were also excluded at this stage for the same reasons. The second column on Table 3 shows the number of instruments retained for each project. Thirty-eight of the 70 instruments were eliminated, leaving 32 instruments with a total of 303 scales.

For all identifiable scales or item groupings, we coded whether any information about each scale's reliability or validity was provided, regardless of the quality of that information. We also coded the type of validity evidence provided--content, convergent/discriminant, or experimental. We defined content validity evidence to be some indication that the items had been selected to represent a domain or dimension that had been defined by research or theory. For example, content validity evidence for a scale intending to measure "Instructional Leadership" might be a description of the dimension from Edmonds' (1979) work to identify and describe that domain. A more elaborate demonstration of content validity would be evidence that the items in the scale correspond to the results of a study that carefully examined principal behaviors related to instruction and mapped out the domain of instructional leadership behaviors.

We defined evidence for convergent/discriminant validity to involve any presentation of correlations among scales in the device or between the scales and measures not included in the device. The more professional validity studies interpreted the correlations for the user.

We defined experimental validity evidence as the presentation of any evidence about the sensitivity of the measure to experimental manipulation of the dimension. For example, a study showing that the "Staff Morale" scale increased after an intervention which involved school staff in setting policy and determining practices counted for evidence of experimental validity.

We did not attempt to judge the quality of the reliablity or validity evidence or to determine whether or not the information supported the scale. We simply coded whether or not such information was presented at all.

We did make a judgment about face validity. We read the title of the scale and the description (where provided) of the dimension that the scale was intended to measure. Then we read each item and judged whether the items appeared to measure the intended dimension.

Table 4 summarizes the available information about the psychometric properties of the scales. The materials for eleven of the 32 instruments included evidence about the reliability of the scales. Twenty-one of the instruments had a large proportion of face-valid scales. That is, 80 to 100% of the scales in these instruments appeared to measure what they intended to measure. Most of the other instruments fell into the 50-79% face-valid category. The distributions for the other types of validity evidence were bimodal: Instruments generally either provided evidence for all or none of the scales. Some content validity evidence (usually based on the effective schools literature) was provided for 18 (56.2%) of the instruments, convergent/discriminant validity evidence for 5 (18.8%) and experimental validity evidence for 2 (6.2%).

A Closer Look at the Higher Quality Instruments

Some of the assessment devices were clearly not yet sufficiently developed to be recommended for general use. This section of our report focuses on only those that appeared of high enough quality to be considered for use by others. We used face validity as the criterion for determining which devices should be further considered. If most of the scales in an instrument (80% or more) had face validity the instrument was retained. Twenty instruments in 11 projects met this criterion.[2] The names of these instruments, their authors and sponsoring organizations, and where users can obtain copies of the instruments are listed in Appendix A.

Table 5 compares these twenty instruments. The table shows that only a handful of the instruments provide information about validity and reliability and reference points for interpretation.

---

[2] A twenty-first was excluded because we had information for two of its eight scales only.

Among the eight instruments for which evidence of reliability is provided--the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire and Interview, the Effective School Battery student and teacher questionnaires, the School Assessment Survey, and the three Norfolk School Improvement Program questionnaires--the reliability information varies in interpretability. For example, the school is the level of analysis appropriate for assessing reliability when measuring school climate, but the Connecticut and Norfolk instruments were accompanied only by reports of analyses conducted at the individual level. The resulting reliability coefficients reflect the extent to which the scales reliably measure differences among people in the school rather than differences among schools. This caution aside, the homogeneity coefficients reported were generally acceptable for the intended purpose of these instruments--school assessment.

For those instruments accompanied by evidence of convergent/discriminant or experimental validity, the evidence usually supported the interpretations suggested for the measures. The evidence was not uniformly supportive, however. For example, the Connecticut manual presented correlations between questionnaire and interview scale scores. Although the scores obtained through one method generally had their highest correlations with the corresponding scores obtained using the other method, there were some exceptions: The questionnaire-based measure "Monitoring School Progress" had higher correlations with four other-named interview scales than it had with the same-named interview scale, and it had an equal correlation with a fifth other-named scale. Furthermore, the Connecticut convergent/discriminant validity evidence presented was based on individual--rather than school-level--analyses.

Table 6 summarizes our estimates of cost for the twenty most promising instruments. The first column shows the approximate cost to buy or photocopy enough copies of the instrument to survey a school of 40 teachers and 800 students. Costs for the Connecticut secondary student and Effective School Battery student questionnaire are higher than others because they are the only instruments that are assumed to be administered to all students. Of course, the costs of these student assessments would be considerably lower if only a random sample of students were assessed. Surveying a random sample of approximately 200 students should yield school-level results equivalent to the more costly method of surveying the entire student population. For some instruments, the figures in column 1 of Table 6 include costs other than the cost of initial procurement. Costs for the Mini-audits and Middle Grades Assessment Program, for example, include training materials. Costs for the School Assessment Survey and Climate Effectiveness Inventory include scoring and preparing feedback.

The second column of the table indicates whether the instruments are reusable. Schools planning to repeat their assessments periodically and districts assessing several schools should invest in reusable instruments.

The third column summarizes our rough estimate of the cost of entering the assessment data into a computer to simplify scoring and feedback. These figures also include additional services for some instruments. For the Effective School Battery teacher and student questionnaires, the School Assessment Survey and the Climate Effectiveness Inventory, these costs include the substantial personnel cost of scoring scales and preparing feedback for each school. For all other instruments this cost must be borne by the district or local school.

The final column gives a rough estimate of the costs in school-level staff time to plan, administer, score, summarize and interpret the assessment data. We found three different levels of intensity of school-level staff time required to perform the assessment. The lowest intensity group (coded "L" in the last column of Table 6) usually required school staff time to organize and administer the instruments, and sometimes to photocopy them. Scoring and summarizing the data were accomplished through a scoring service or through the school district office. This category includes instruments for which the scoring and interpretation are accomplished in the district office, which presents a substantial cost to the school district, but not to the individual school. The next level (coded "M" for "moderate") required that the school staff score and interpret the information as well. And the highest intensity group ("H") required that the school staff interview the respondents. This can be very time consuming. For example, using the Middle Grades Assessment Program to assess a middle school of 800 students and 40 teachers would involve 15 staff persons for 37 hours apiece--a total of 555 hours or 70 person days. Of course, the costs in staff time must be weighed against the benefits of the staff being so actively involved in the assessment process.

The instruments examined in Table 5 and Table 6 differ in content. Table 7 shows which instruments measure which "effective school" characteristic, and Table 8 shows which instruments measure other characteristics that do not fit easily into the "effective schools" scheme. Table 7 includes measures judged to lack face validity (these are indicated with lower-case letters). Table 8 excludes such measures.

The good news in Tables 7 and 8 is that a face-valid scale exists for just about anything anybody might want to measure. The bad news is that these measures are spread across different instruments.

The broadest coverage of effective schools characteristics (in terms of the number of characteristics measured) is found in the Colorado State Department of Education's Indicators of Quality Schools and in the two Connecticut secondary-level surveys. Recall, however, that no quantitative evidence of reliability or validity exists for these instruments. Of those instruments that did provide quantitative evidence of reliability and validity, the Connecticut School Effectiveness elementary and Effective Schools Battery secondary instruments have the broadest coverage of the effective schools characteristics.

Table 8 reminds us that the "effective school characteristics" are not the only important school characteristics. Several instruments were constructed on different research bases. The School Assessment Survey, for example, provides excellent measures of some of the process variables central to organizational development--characteristics such as degree of staff conflict, balance of power, and adequacy of communication. The Middles Grades Assessment Program measures characteristics of the school's academic and nonacademic program that are important to the development of middle school-aged youths. And the Effective School Battery measures several characteristics of the student population--such as attachment to school, belief in conventional social rules, and positive peer influence--related to character, conduct, and persistence in school.

Discussion

In 1985, a joint committee representing the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education established standards for educational and psychological testing. These standards require, among other things, that information be provided that allows the test-user to evaluate the technical adequacy of the test. Most of the assessment instruments included in our study fall short of this standard. Without such information, how can the user have confidence that the items measure a unitary construct, that they measure the construct they intend to measure, that the differences in scores on a profile are meaningful? Similarly, many of the instruments lacked guidance for administration. Even in those cases that provided some guidelines, the guidelines were often vague. For example, a common instruction was to allow "some students" to complete the questionnaire. Without knowledge of the characteristics of the sample, what could the results possibly mean?

A recent review of the state of the art in measuring school effectiveness (Rowan, 1985) called for greater attention to the psychometric properties of school assessment instruments. We cannot assume that a group of items actually measures what it is intended to measure with minimal error: We must demonstrate it. Our study found that careful developmental work to fine-tune measures was rare. Given the widespread use of these instruments to guide school improvement efforts, the absence of evidence about reliability and validity is alarming.

Informal interviews with practitioners who used some of the weaker instruments provided insight into the consequences of the use of low quality measures. One educator revealed that her system had recently decided to abandon its current assessment program, which involved the use of instruments that had been developed elsewhere, in favor of developing its own instruments. We were told that the assessment information was not "pure", i.e., that the results were not meaningful because the scales mixed apples and oranges.

The decision to develop another assessment battery specifically for this educator's district is an expensive consequence of the use of low-validity measures. Had the original measures been subjected to the careful developmental work necessary to validate an instrument, they would have been more likely to have been accepted in the new site.

The failure to demonstrate the psychometric adequacy of most of the instruments in our study probably stems from external pressure to develop such instruments on an unreasonable timeline. State departments and school districts have had to scramble to develop instruments, develop the capacity to process assessment data, and install a process to help individual schools use the results of the assessment effectively.

Another source of low validity is the research base on which many of the measures are purportedly based. This is especially true of home-grown measures with dimension names corresponding to the content of the "effective schools" lists. Many of the projects are implicitly based upon the effective schools literature. But that literature does not provide a clear enough definition of the effective schools characteristics to guide the development of measurement devices. Consequently, devices citing the same literature include scales with the same or similar names but very different contents. For example, items in scales having the name "Safe and Orderly Environment" range from

"How often are you afraid you will be beaten up at school?" to "The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable" to "There is evidence of high staff morale." Different interpretations of the research underlying the effective schools lists results in different measures of the same underlying dimension.

In contrast, the instruments developed independently of the effective schools movement--e.g., the School Assessment Survey, Effective School Battery, Middle Grades Assessment Program, and Organizational Health Description Questionnaire--appear to be based on more carefully considered, precise, well-defined domains. The School Assessment Survey, for example, is based on a theory of organizational structure and process that yields a set of distinct dimensions that characterize organizations. The measures were tested and refined until they yielded valid and reliable measures of those separable organizational characteristics. The ESB and MGAP instruments also have sound theoretical and empirical grounding. Educational practitioners would do better to build their school assessment programs on a carefully defined research base than on hastily prepared instruments that are only nominally related to the features of schools included in typical effective schools lists.

The interpretation of assessment results warrants some discussion. A raw score or item frequency generally has little meaning in isolation from some type of comparison score. All of the instruments explicitly or implicitly provided such a comparison. Comparison points included (a) arbitrary cut-points (e.g. selecting for further discussion those areas whose mean scale score fell below some arbitrary point, (b) other scores in the profile (e.g., selecting those scales with the lowest scores on the profile), (c) expected or desired conditions, (d) norms for schools in a local or national sample. Seldom was evidence provided that the particular comparison was useful. Authors frequently apologized for the arbitrary nature of the comparison, stating that the instrument was intended to be "descriptive, not prescriptive" and that the users of the test should interpret the assessment information relative to their own standards. But as a practical matter, users cannot interpret raw scores in the absence of some knowledge about the distribution of those scores.

Test developers, in order to comply with the professional standards for educational and psychological tests, must present evidence that the instrument is valid for the use intended. If a cutpoint is recommended, there must be evidence that the cutpoint has practical utility for measuring the desired outcome. If the developer recommends that the differences in relative elevation of the raw scores in a profile be treated as meaningful, there must be evidence that differences in these scores are in fact meaningful. If scores are compared with a norm group, there should be evidence that the norm group is appropriate.

Conclusions

Our conclusions must be tempered with several concerns about the quality of our data. Although our response rate was high, the materials we received were often incomplete. Several instruments were excluded from our review because we had insufficient information to code face validity and other characteristics of the scales. We are not certain that the retained instruments are representative of instruments in general. We suspect that their quality is higher than that of the devices for which we had difficulty obtaining information. Also, several instruments were in the early stages of development. A few of the authors were in the process of compiling their test manuals, others were revising their instruments. In a few cases, the contact person listed in the Miles and Kaufman directory was no longer with the sponsoring organization, and the person who helped us may not have forwarded all relevant materials.

Nevertheless, our data represent the best snapshot we could develop of the current use of assessment instruments. Readers are encouraged to form their own judgments by examining our more detailed account of the contents of each instrument provided in Appendix A or by reading the instruments' manuals where these are available.

These cautions aside, it seems clear that reliable, valid, practical measures of several important dimensions of school organization and composition exist, but they exist amidst an ocean of measures whose characteristics are unknown. The following instruments appear to have most promise for yielding reliable and valid measures of important school characteristics:

> For assessments relying upon teachers and other adult school staff, the Connecticut State Department of Education School Effectiveness Questionnaire and Interview are inexpensive tools tailored specifically to the effective schools lists. For schools wishing to assess a broader range of school characteristics, these instruments might be augmented with the Organizational Health Description Questionnaire (OHDQ), School Assessment Survey (SAS), Climate Effectiveness Inventory (CEI), and the Effective School Battery (ESB), depending upon the content desired. The OHDQ and SAS are especially useful for diagnosing organizational struc-

ture and process, the CEI for discipline related constructs, and the ESB for both organizational health and discipline. The Connecticut teacher instruments are not recommended for use in high schools, and the ESB is not yet normed for elementary schools.

Only three of the twenty instruments regarded as candidates for general use (the Connecticut secondary student, Effective School Battery and Middle Grades Assessment Program) systematically include students in the assessment process. The Connecticut instrument looks promising but is still in the development stage--no information on reliability or validity is yet available. The Middle Grades Assessment Program is more than an assessment tool. The assessment is imbedded in a larger staff development process, and a considerable commitment of staff time is required. The Effective School Battery Student Questionnaire is comprehensive and well-validated but relatively expensive. None of these student assessment instruments are suitable for elementary school students.

We conclude with a call for collaboration between researchers and practitioners to develop, test and refine school assessment instruments. Instruments developed by researchers without practitioner input about what needs to be measured may be reliable and valid, but they may be less useful than they could be. Instruments developed by practitioners without technical assistance from researchers or others knowledgeable about test development and validation procedures may have questionable validity.

References

Anderson, L. M., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 79, 193-223.

Brookover, W. B., Beamer, L., Efthim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Pasalacqua, J., & Tornatzky, L. (1982). Creating effective schools: An inservice program for enhancing school school learning climate and achievement. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.

Connecticut Department of Education. (1984). Handbook for use of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire. Hartford, CT: Author.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 15-24.

Fox, R. S., Boies, H. E., Brainard, E., Fletcher, E., Huge, J. S., Martin, C. L., Maynard, W., Monasmith, J., Olivero, J., Schmuck, R., Shaheen, T. A., & Stegeman, W. H. (1983). School climate improvement: A challenge to the school administrator. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Furtwengler, W. J., & Redelheim, P. (1986). Climate Effectiveness Inventory documentation. (Available from Dr. Willis J. Furtwengler, Research and Service Institute, Suite 233, 2 Maryland Farms, Brentwood, TN 37027)

Good, T. L., & Grouws, D. A. (1979). The Missouri Mathematics Effectiveness Project: An experimental study in fourth-grade classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 71, 355-362.

Guzzetti, B. J. (1983). Report on instruments for measuring school effectiveness. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL).

Kimpston, R. D., & Sonnabend, L. C. (1973). Organizational health: A requisite for innovation? Educational Leadership, 30, 543-547.

Miles, M. B., & Kaufman, T. (1985). A directory of programs. In R. M. J. Kyle (Ed.), Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. Elementary School Journal, 83, 427-452.

Rosenshine, B. (1976). Classroom instruction. In N. Gage (Ed.), The psychology of teaching methods. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rowan, B. (1985). The assessment of school effectiveness. In R. M. J. Kyle (Ed.), Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Shoemaker, J. et al. (1982, March). Use of multiple data sources to assess school effectiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Weil, M., Marshalek, B., Mitman, A., Murphy, J., Hallinger, P, & Pruyn, J. (1984, April). Effective and typical schools: How different are they? Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Scales Measuring Each Effective Schools Characteristic

Area	N	%
School-site management	5	1.7
Instructional leadership	13	4.3
Staff stability	0	0.0
Curriculum articulation and organization	10	3.3
Schoolwide staff development	5	1.7
Parental involvement and support	17	5.6
School-wide recognition of academic success	5	1.7
Maximized learning time	16	5.3
District support	0	0.0
Frequent monitoring and feedback	25	8.3
Effective instruction (other than included above)	10	3.3
Collaborative planning/congenial relationships	19	6.3
Sense of community	7	2.3
Clear goals/high expectations	28	9.2
Order and discipline	24	7.9
Some combination of above	58	19.1
None of the above	61	20.1
Total	303	

Table 2

Characteristics of School Assessment Instruments (N=70)

Characteristic	N	%
Materials include		
Recommendations for sampling	17	25
Instructions for administration	13	18
Instructions for interpretation	25	36
Feedback includes		
Raw frequencies, means, or percentages	39	76
Percentile ranks	3	6
Expected vs. observed scores	6	12
Subgroup analyses	15	29
Profiles	23	45
Narratives	17	33
Technical information (e.g., standard deviations, standard errors, confidence intervals)	17	28
Comparisons with past performance	13	22
Comparisons with a local sample	9	15
Comparisons with a national sample	4	7

Note. Number of cases on which a percentage is computed vary from item to item due to missing data. N's range from 51 to 70.

Table 3

Total Number of Climate Assessment Instruments Used in Each Project, and Number with Scales Identified[a]

Project name	Number of instruments		Number of identifiable scales
	Unique	With identified scales	
San Diego County Effective Schools Program	6	2	16
School Effectiveness Program (SEP), Santa Clara County Office of Education	3	0	--
School Improvement Through Leagues and Clusters, Colorado Dept. of Education	3	3	58
Effective Schools Program, McREL	1	1	9
Connecticut School Effectiveness Program, CT State Department of Education	4	4	37
Chicago Effective Schools Project (CESP), Chicago Public Schools	1	1	6
Kentucky School Effectiveness Program, KY Department of Education	7	1	10
Program Development Evaluation, Center for Social Organization of Schools	2	2	35
School Improvement Program, Detroit Public Schools	1	1	7
Michigan School Improvement Project (M-SIP), MI Department of Education	1	1	4
Project SHAL, Area 1 St. Louis	1	1	2
School Improvement Project (SIP), New York City Board of Education	10	0	--
Middle Grades Assessment Program (MGAP), Center for Early Adolescence	1	1	9
School Improvement in Basic Skills, Cincinnati Public Schools	5	0	--
Effective Schools, KEDS--Kent State Center for Educational Development and Strategic Services	2	1	7
Onward to Excellence/Goal Based Education Program, NWREL	2	2	33
Principals as Instructional Leaders, NWREL	4	0	--
Replicating Success, Philadelphia Public Schools	5	0	--
School Effectiveness Training Program, Research for Better Schools, Inc.	1	1	9
School Improvement Process, organization name withheld	3	3	18
School Effectiveness Program, Research and Service Institute	1	1	7
Systematic Program for Instruction, Remediation and Acceleration of Learning (SPIRAL), Norfolk Public Schools	6	6	36
TOTAL	70	32	303

---

[a] "Identified" means we were able to determine which items were scored with which scale.

Table 4

Evidence of Psychometric Properties of Scales in School Assessment Instruments (N Instruments = 32, N Scales = 303)

	Scales with evidence of property							
Psychometric property	No evidence at all		1-49% of scales		50-79% of scales		80-100% of scales	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reliability	21	(65.5)	—		--		11	(34.4)
Face validity	0	(0.0)	2	(6.3)	9	(28.1)	21	(65.6)
Content validity	14	(43.8)	1	(3.1)	2	(6.2)	15	(46.9)
Convergent/discriminant validity	26	(81.3)	--		--		6	(18.8)
Experimental validity	30	(93.8)	—		--		2	(6.2)

Note. Percentages sum to 100 across the rows. Face validity was determined by coder judgment. All other properties are simply coded as present or absent regardless of whether the evidence presented supported the scale.

Table 5

A Closer Look at Instruments with Face Validity

Instrument	Primary assessment method		Approp. for which levels			Respondent				Guidelines are provided for			Instruments can be scored by			Minutes to complete			
	Q	I	E	Jr	Sr	T	S	A	P	Sampling	Interpreting	Administering	Hand	Scoring service	Local computer	S	T	A	P
1. Organizational Health Description Questionnaire (4)	X		X	X	X	X		X			X		X		X		10	10	
2. Mini-Audits 1 & 2 (6)	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	180	180	180	180
3. A School for the Eighties and Nineties: A Priorities Search (6)	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	30	10	10	10
4. Indicators of Quality Schools (6)	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		60	60	
5. Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (8)	X		X	X		X		X			X	X			X		30	30	
6. Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview (8)		X	X	X		X		X			X	X			X		60	60	
7. Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Staff Questionnaire (8)	X				X	X		X		X					X		30	30	
8. Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Student Questionnaire (8)	X				X		X			X					X	30			
9. Effective School Battery Teacher Survey (13)	X			X	X	X				X	X	X		X			15		
10. Effective School Battery Student Survey (13)	X			X	X		X			X	X	X		X		75			
11. Detroit School Effectiveness Questionnaire--Elementary and Middle School Edition (15)	X		X	X		X		X			X				X		30	30	
12. Michigan School Improvement Survey (16)	X		X			X				X	X	X	X				15		
13. Middle Grades Assessment Program (21)		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			30	50	180	40
14. Building-Level Effectiveness Survey (26)	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X				75	75	
15. Classroom-Level Effectiveness Survey (26)	X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X				40		
16. School Assessment Survey (31)	X		X[a]	X	X	X				X	X	X		X			30		
17. Climate Effectiveness Inventory (35)	X		X	X	X	X					X	X		X			15		
18. Norfolk School Improvement Program Teacher Ques. (36)	X		X			X				X					X		30		
19. Norfolk Special Program and Resource Teacher Ques. (36)	X		X			X									X		30		
20. Norfolk Principal Ques. (36)	X		X					X							X[a]			30	

Key. Q = questionnaire; I = interview; E = elementary; Jr = junior high or middle; Sr = senior high; T = teacher or other nonadministrative school staff; S = student; A = administrator; P = parent or other community member. "Local computer" means that the instruments are scored by a school system computer, and "technical information" refers to standard deviations, standard errors, and confidence intervals. The numbers in parentheses refer to the Miles and Kaufman (1985) project numbers used in Appendix A. See the appendix for full names of instruments and sponsoring organizations.

[a] Calculated at the individual rather than at the school level.

Table 5 (Cont.)

Instrument	Average reliability coefficient	Any evidence of each type of validity			Results are presented							Reference points used for interpretation		
		Content	Converg/ discrim.	Experimental	as raw freq. means, percentages	as percentile ranks	as expected vs. actual	for subgroups	in a profile	in a narrative	with technical information	School's past performance	National sample	Local sample
1. Organizational Health Description Questionnaire (4)		X			X			X	X					
2. Mini-Audits 1 & 2 (6)					X		X	X	X					
3. A School for the Eighties and Nineties: A Priorities Search (6)		X			X		X	X	X					
4. Indicators of Quality Schools (6)		X			X		X	X	X					
5. Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (8)	.80[a]	X	X		X				X		X	X		
6. Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview (8)	.77[a]	X	X		X				X		X	X		
7. Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Staff Questionnaire (8)					X									
8. Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Student Questionnaire (8)					X									
9. Effective School Battery Teacher Survey (13)	.78	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
10. Effective School Battery Student Survey (13)	.66	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
11. Detroit School Effectiveness Questionnaire--Elementary and Middle School Edition (15)					X									
12. Michigan School Improvement Survey (16)					X		X		X					
13. Middle Grades Assessment Program (21)		X								X				
14. Building-Level Effectiveness Survey (26)					X				X					
15. Classroom-Level Effectiveness Survey (26)					X				X					
16. School Assessment Survey (31)	.88	X	X		X				X	X	X		X	
17. Climate Effectiveness Inventory (35)		X	X		X		X		X		X		X	
18. Norfolk School Improvement Program Teacher Ques. (36)	.84[a]	X			X					X	X	X		X
19. Norfolk Special Program and Resource Teacher Ques. (36)	.84[a]	X			X					X	X	X		X
20. Norfolk Principal Ques. (36)	.69	X			X					X	X	X		X

Key. Q = questionnaire; I = interview; E = elementary; Jr = junior high or middle; Sr = senior high; T = teacher or other nonadministrative school staff; S = student; A = administrator; P = parent or other community member. "Local computer" means that the instruments are scored by a school system computer, and "technical information" refers to standard deviations, standard errors, and confidence intervals. The numbers in parentheses refer to the Miles and Kaufman (1985) project numbers used in Appendix A. See the appendix for full instrument names and sponsoring organizations.

[a] Calculated at the individual rather than at the school level.

Table 6

Estimated Cost of Instruments with Face Validity

	Initial cost of materials (in dollars)	Are materials reusable?	Cost to enter data (in dollars)	Level of staff time required
1. Organizational Health Description Questionnaire (4)	8	N	7	L
2. Mini-Audits 1 & 2 (6)	153	N	29	M
3. A School for the Eighties and Nineties: A Priorities Search (6)	6	N	7	M
4. Indicators of Quality Schools (6)	52	N	60	M
5. Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (8)	18	Y	15	L
6. Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview (8)	2	Y	10	H
7. Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Staff Questionnaire (8)	16	Y	15	L
8. Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Student Questionnaire (8)	240	Y	148	L
9. Effective School Battery Teacher Survey (13)	138	Y	80	L
10. Effective School Battery Student Survey (13)	559	Y	530	L
11. Detroit School Effectiveness Questionnaire--Elementary and Middle School Edition (15)	14	N	10	L
12. Michigan School Improvement Survey (16)	14	N	4	M
13. Middle Grades Assessment Program (21)	275	Y	NA	H
14. Building-Level Effectiveness Survey (26)	14	N	8	L
15. Classroom-Level Effectiveness Survey (26)	18	N	12	L
16. School Assessment Survey (31)	170	N	0[a]	L
17. Climate Effectiveness Inventory (35)	200	Y	0[a]	L
18. Norfolk School Improvement Program Teacher Questionnaire (36)	24	Y	2	L
19. Norfolk Special Program and Resource Resource Teacher Questionnaire (36)	--[b]	Y	--[b]	L
20. Norfolk Principal Questionnaire (36)	--[b]	Y	--[b]	L

Note. Estimated costs are based on the following assumptions: The entire population of teachers or students (whichever is appropriate) in a school containing 40 teachers and 800 students completes the instrument. Photocopying costs 5 per page, and data are entered into a computer at a cost of $1.85 per 1000 keystrokes. The numbers in parentheses refer to the Miles and Kaufman (1985) project numbers used in Appendix A. See the appendix for full instrument names and sponsoring organizations.

[a] Processing cost included in cost of materials.

[b] Costs are insignificant due to small numbers of persons surveyed.

Table 7

Coverage of "Effective Schools" Characteristics for Instruments with Face Validity

	Instrument number																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Respondent groups	TA	TA	STAP	TA	TA	TA	TA	S	T	S	TA	T	STAP	TA	T	T	T	T	T	A
Characteristics from "Effective Schools Research"																				
School-site management	X	x		X												X				
Instructional leadership				X	X	X	X				X		X			X		X	X	X
Curriculum articulation and organization				X							X			X	X					
Schoolwide staff development	X						X		X			X	X							
Parental involvement and support				X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X			X			
Schoolwide recognition of academic success				X			X	X		X			x	X	X					
Maximized learning time				X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X					
District support				X																
Frequent monitoring of student progress and feedback				X	X	X	X	X			X		x	X	X			X	X	X
Effective instruction (other than above)		X		X					X	X		X			X			X	X	X
Collaborative planning and collegial relationships	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X				X				
Sense of community, morale	X			X			x	X	X	X										
Clear goals and high expectations commonly shared	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Order and discipline				x	X	X	X	X	X	X	x		X	X	X	X	X			X

Note. An "X" in the grid indicates that a measure judged face valid exists in the instrument. An "x" indicates that a measure exists, but that it appears to lack face validity. The letters in the "respondent group" row stand for the following: T = teachers or other nonadministrative school staff; S = students; A = administrative school staff; P = parents or other community members. Instrument numbers are as follows: 1 = Organizational Health Description Questionnaire; 2 = Mini-Audits; 3 = A School for the Eighties and Nineties; 4 = Indicators of Quality Schools; 5 = Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire; 6 = Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview; 7 = Connecticut Secondary Staff Questionnaire; 8 = Connecticut Secondary Student Questionnaire; 9 = Effective School Battery Teacher Survey; 10 = Effective School Battery Student Survey; 11 = Detroit School Effectiveness Questionnaire; 12 = Michigan School Improvement Survey; 13 = Middle Grades Assessment Program; 14 = Building-Level Effectiveness Survey; 15 = Classroom-Level Effectiveness Survey; 16 = School Assessment Survey; 17 = Climate Effectiveness Inventory; 18 = Norfolk School Improvement Program Teacher Questionnaire; 19 = Norfolk School Improvement Program Special Program and Resource Teacher Questionnaire; 20 = Norfolk School Improvement Program Principal Questionnaire. See Appendix A for sponsoring organizations.

Table 8

Additional Characteristics Covered in Instruments with Face Validity

Characteristic	Instrument numbers
Additional characteristics of teaching and the instructional program	
Active learning, flexible curricular and extracurricular activities, diversity	2, 3, 13
Individualized expectations, materials, methods, and rewards	2
Preparation for life in the eighties and nineties	3
Characteristics of the nonacademic program	
Provision of training for nonacademic skills and competencies	2, 17
Provision of experiences to enhance self-definition	13
Opportunities for active student participation	10, 13
Opportunities for healthy social interaction and forming attachments	13, 15
Opportunities for physical activity	13
Other organizational characteristics	
Staff ownership of school problems	17
Student involvement in decision making, student responsibility	2, 4, 9, 10, 13
Monitoring staff performance and reward structure	14
Open communication	1, 2, 16
Equity	7, 8
Staff conflict	16
Adequacy of resources, suitability of physical plant	2, 9, 14, 15
Characteristics of the student population	
Attachment to school, positive peer influence, belief in conventional social rules, self-concept, avoidance of punishment, interpersonal competency, parental education level	10
Characteristics of the teacher population	
Job satisfaction, nonauthoritarian attitudes	9

Note. See Table 7 for instrument names corresponding to numbers and for respondent groups for each instrument. Only scales judged face valid are included on this table.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A: TABLE OF CONTENTS

NO. PROJECT NAME AND INSTRUMENTS PAGE

04 San Diego County Effective Schools Program
- Building Effective Schools--Organizational Health Description for Elementary and Secondary Schools, (1985)..................A-1
- Student Engagement Observation Form (1985).......................A-6
- San Diego Effective Schools Parent Survey (1986).................A-8
- Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview with the Principal...A-10

05 Santa Clara County School Effectiveness Program (SEP)
- School Effectiveness Program Survey-Student Questionnaire (1983)..A-14
- School Effectiveness Program Survey-Parent Questionnaire (1983)..A-19
- School Effectiveness Program Survey-Teacher Questionnaire (1983)..A-23

06 Colorado Dept. of Education--School Improvement Through Leagues and Clusters
- Indicators of Quality Schools--Instrument to Assess the Educational Quality of Your School (1982)....................A-29
- Mini-Audit No. 1: Activities and Projects for Climate Improvement Program Determinants; Mini-Audit No. 2: Process and Material Determinants (1980).......................A-34
- A School for the Eighties and Nineties: A Priority Search (1983)...A-38

07 McREL--Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory Effective Schools Program
- Describing Your School's Characteristics (DYSC, 1984)..........A-41
- Academic Efficiency Index Instrument (1986)....................A-45

08 CT State Dept. of Education--Connecticut School Effectiveness Program
- Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview (1981), Elementary, Middle School Level..................................A-47
- Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (1981)...........A-51
- Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Staff Questionnaire (1984)..A-55
- Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Student Questionnaire (1984)..A-60

10 Chicago Public Schools--Chicago Effective Schools Project (CESP)
- Chicago Effective Schools Project: The Needs Assessment Instrument (1982)...A-65

12 KY Dept. of Education--Kentucky School Effectiveness Program
- School Effectiveness Analysis Teacher Interview (1984)..........A-68
- School Effectiveness Analysis Principal Interview (1984)........A-70
- School Effectiveness Analysis Student Officer Interview (1984)..A-72

NO. PROJECT NAME AND INSTRUMENTS PAGE

School Effectiveness Analysis Elementary Student Questionnaire (1984)........A-74
School Effectiveness Analysis Secondary Student Questionnaire (1984)........A-76
School Effectiveness Analysis Parent Questionnaire (1984)........A-78
School Effectiveness Analysis Teacher/Administrator Assessment Questionnaire (1984)........A-80
School Effectiveness Analysis Class Engaged Time Analysis (1984)........A-84

13 Center for Social Organization of Schools--Program Development Evaluation (PDE)

The Effective School Battery: Teacher Survey (1984)........A-86
The Effective School Battery: Student Survey (1984)........A-91

15 Detroit Public Schools--School Improvement Program

School Effectiveness Questionnaire--Elementary and Middle School Edition (1985)........A-96

16 MI Dept. of Education--Michigan School Improvement Program (M-SIP)

The School Improvement Survey (1983)........A-100

18 Area 1 St. Louis School District--Project SHAL

SHAL Project Assessment (1981)........A-102

19 New York City Public Schools--School Improvement Program (SIP)

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Principal Interview Form (2nd Edition--1980)........A-104
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument --Assistant Principal Interview Form (2nd Edition--1980)........A-106
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Classroom Instructional Staff Interview Form A (2nd Edition--1980)........A-108
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Classroom Instructional Staff Interview Form B (2nd Edition--1980)........A-110
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Classroom Teacher Questionnaire (1980)........A-112
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Special Program Instructional Staff Interview--2nd Edition (1980)........A-114
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Special Program Teacher Questionnaire (1980)........A-116
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Para Interview Form (1980)........A-118
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Auxiliary Staff Interview Form (1980)........A-120
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument--Parent Interview Form (1980)........A-122
School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument --Building and Grounds Observational Assessment (1980)........A-124

NO. PROJECT NAME AND INSTRUMENTS PAGE

21 Center for Early Adolescence--MGAP
Middle Grades Assessment Program (1984)........................A-126

22 Cincinnati Public Schools--School Improvement in Basic Skills
Cincinnati Teacher Survey (1981)..............................A-130
Cincinnati Field Administrator Survey (1981)..................A-132
Cincinnati Parent Survey (1981)...............................A-134
Cincinnati Elementary Student Survey (1981)...................A-136
Cincinnati Secondary Student Survey (1981)....................A-138

24 KEDS--Kent State Center for Educational Development and Strategic Services
Student Survey (1985)..A-140
You're the Teacher: A Building Assessment (1985)..............A-142

26 NWREL--Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory--Onward to Excellence/Goal Based Education Program
Building-Level Effectiveness Survey (1982)....................A-145
Classroom-Level Effectiveness Survey (1982)...................A-149

27 NWREL--Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory--Principals as Instructional Leaders
Effective Elementary Schools Analysis (1981)..................A-154

28 Philadelphia Public Schools--Replicating Success
Replicating Success Needs Assessment--Additional Questions for Junior High Schools (1984)..............................A-157
Replicating Success Needs Assessment-Questions to Principals (1984)...A-159
Replicating Success Needs Assessment-Community Interview (1984)...A-161
Replicating Success Needs Assessment-Teacher Interview (1984)..A-163
Replicating Success Needs Assessment-Principal Interview Form--Parts I, II, and III (1984)...........................A-165

31 Research for Better Schools--School Effectiveness Training Program
School Assessment Survey (1984)................................A-167

33 School Improvement Process (Organization Name Withheld)
Indicators of Effective Schools--Parent Survey (1982)..........A-170
Indicators of Effective Schools--Student Survey (1982).........A-173
Indicators of Effective Schools--Teacher Survey (1982).........A-176

NO. PROJECT NAME AND INSTRUMENTS PAGE

35 Research and Service Institute--School Effectiveness Program
Climate Effectiveness Inventory (1985)........................A-179

36 Norfolk Public Schools--Systematic Program for Instruction, Remediation and Acceleration of Learning (SPIRAL)
School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Auxiliary/Paraprofessional Personnel Questionnaire (1984)..............A-183
School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Parent Questionnaire (1984)....................................A-186
School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Pupil Questionnaire (1984)...................................A-189
School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Special Program/Resource Teacher Questionnaire (1984)................A-192
School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Teacher Questionnaire (1984)..A-195
School Improvement Program Questionnaires--Elementary Principal Questionnaire (1984)..............................A-198

APPENDIX A: SUMMARIES OF SCHOOL CLIMATE INSTRUMENTS

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Building Effective Schools--Organizational Health Description for Elementary and Secondary Schools, (1985), Project No. 4

2. Author(s):

Richard D. Kimpston and Leslie C. Sonnabend.

3. Institution:

San Diego Public Schools

4. Available from:

Lean King, Area Director, Educational Services Division, San Diego County Office of Education, 6401 Linda Vista Rd., San Diego, CA 92111

5. Intended Purpose:

This instrument assesses the perceptions of principal, teachers, and other school staff about the organizational health of the school. Results are used to set priorities for school improvement and to evaluate programs.

6. Reliability Information:

A Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) article provides evidence that the device measures only five dimensions of organizational health with some reliability. The use of this instrument to measure ten dimensions of organizational health appears suspect.

7. Validity Information:

Same as above with respect to validity.

8. Scoring:

Can be hand-scored or machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Goal Focus--5 items

Questions ask if the school's goals are discussed, achievable, appropriate, known, and agreed upon.

Sample: "Faculty members are generally unaware that goals exist for this school."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension is not measured reliably by the instrument.

(2) Communication Adequacy--5 items

Questions ask about the openness of administration-teacher and school-community lines of communication.

Sample: "Procedures for communication with the community have been established."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension and "Resource Utilization" are not distinct dimensions. They combined the two scales.

(3) Optional Power Equalization--5 items

Questions ask about the extent to which decision making uses the democratic process, whether teachers' opinions are valued, and whether faculty can become school leaders.

Sample: "Decision making in the school could best be described as democratic."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension and "Problem Solving Adequacy" are not distinct dimensions. They combined the two scales.

(4) Resource Utilization--5 items

Questions ask about faculty awareness of and use of available resources and opportunities for professional development.

Samples: "There is no opportunity for faculty to grow and develop professionally in this school."

"The strengths of faculty members are utilized in this school."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension and "Communication Adequacy" are not distinct dimensions. They combined the two scales.

(5) Cohesiveness--5 items

Questions ask whether there is a feeling of togetherness within the faculty, the value of professional association, the responsiveness of the organization, and teacher satisfaction.

Samples: "Most teachers would rather teach in this school than someplace else."

"Many school problems are solved by group action."

This scale lacks face validity.

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension and "Morale" are not distinct dimensions. They combined the two scales.

(6) Morale--5 items

Questions ask about teacher willingness to do extra work, general school atmosphere, informal social interaction, and whether or not teachers enjoy their work.

Samples: "The teachers in this building enjoy their work."

"Teachers enjoy getting together informally with other faculty members."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension and "Cohesiveness" are not distinct dimensions. They combined the two scales.

(7) Innovativeness--5 items

Questions ask about the climate of experimentation and innovation in the school.

Sample: "Ideas for improvement generally receive support in this school."

(8) Autonomy--5 items

Questions ask about the extent of and typical response to the external pressures.

Samples: "In our school there is a willingness to respond to community requests but the action taken is based upon professional knowledge."

"Teachers in this school are given considerable latitude in carrying out instruction."

(9) Adaptation--5 items

Questions ask about the change process within the school.

Samples: "A deterrent to change in this school is the stress which accompanies that change."

"This school has an ongoing plan for facilitating change."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension is not measured relibably by the instrument.

(10) Problem Solving Adequacy--5 items

Questions ask about how the school identifies and confronts problems, whether faculty opinions are used to find solutions to problems, and whether or not the school evaluates its problem-solving capability.

Samples: "Faculty opinions are solicited but seldom used in our school."

"In our school, procedures have been established to evaluate our effectiveness in resolving school problems."

The Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) factor analysis indicated that this dimension and "Optional Power Equalization" are not distinct dimensions. They combined the two scales.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This assessment device provides broad coverage of organizational health indicators. The survey is short and easy to complete and score. However, there is considerable overlap among the dimensions. For example, Problem Solving Adequacy and Optional Power Utilization have overlapping content as do Cohesiveness and Morale. Comments under each scale indicate which dimensions appear to be reliably measured by the device, according to the Kimpston and Sonnabend (1973) Educational Leadership article.

11. Comments:

The San Diego Office of Education has an ambitious school climate assessment program. The information we received in response to our initial request indicated that thirteen different instruments were currently being used. Most of those instruments had been developed by other organizations and were modified in relatively minor ways for use in California. Since our initial request, the Office has been developing its own instruments in order to better address the needs of its own state's improvement efforts. Staff questionnaires and interview instruments and a student questionnaire instrument are currently being field-tested, and item-analyses will be performed during the summer of 1986.

This appendix describes only four of the instruments used in San Diego's program. See projects 8 and 21 for descriptions of instruments on which several additional San Diego instruments are based.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Student Engagement Observation Form (1985), Project No. 4

2. Author(s):

   Northwest Regional Education Laboratory

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Lean King, Area Director, Educational Services Division, San Diego County Office of Education, 6401 Linda Vista Rd., San Diego, CA 92111

5. Intended Purpose:

   This observation instrument provides some measures of the use of time in school as one basis for setting priorities and evaluating school improvement programs.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   This instrument yields rates for the following kinds of use of time: (1) Engaged--Interactive, (2) Engaged--Noninteractive, (3) Management/Transition, (4) Unoccupied or Observing, (5) Socializing, (6) Working on Other Assignments, (7) Temporarily Out of Room, (8) Total Engagement Rate.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

    This classroom observation instrument measures an important dimension in a simple manner. Clear guidelines are provided about which classes should be observed. However, reliability information is lacking, and it is questionable whether one observation per class yields reliable and valid data.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from analyses in the main body of the report because it is an observation instrument.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   San Diego Effective Schools Parent Survey (1986), Project No. 4

2. Author(s):

   San Diego County Office of Education Effective Schools Cadre: Sally Pollack, Chair, Mary Beall, Janet Chrispeels, David Homiston, Michael Johnson, Lean King, Rita King, Doyle Knirk, Carol Leighty, Sammie McCormack, Thomas Nagel, Bill Padelford, Dan Watson, Chris Wilson

3. Institution:

   San Diego County Office of Education

4. Available from:

   Lean King, Area Director, Educational Services Division, San Diego County Office of Education, 6401 Linda Vista Rd., San Diego, CA 92111

5. Intended Purpose:

   This parent questionnaire for elementary and secondary schools was used in the San Diego County Effective Schools Program to assess parent perceptions of the school regarding effective school variables, school climate, and home-school relations. Results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate programs.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored or machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   One hundred twelve questions ask about parent satisfaction with child's progress, home-school communication and cooperation, academic expectations, general school climate, discipline and safety, homework, extracurricular activities, school rewards, and resources.

   Samples: "When I seek information, I can usually trust the information I receive from the school as being complete and accurate."

"To the best of my knowledge, not much class time is lost because of disruptive student behavior."

"If my child breaks a school rule, I support the teacher in disciplining my child."

We cannot assess the item content and face validity because we do not have instructions for scoring the instrument.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This instrument is carefully and attractively prepared and appears easy to administer and score. It does address important parent concerns in relation to effective schools and school climate variables. We have no information on reliability, validity, or scoring. San Diego State Department of Education staff report that item analyses will be completed during the summer of 1986.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from our analysis of scales.

11. **Comments:**

This instrument was excluded from analyses in the main body of the report because it is an observation instrument.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview with the Principal, Project No. 4.

2. Author(s):

   Not specified--modified from the ASCD Effective Schools Survey.

3. Institution:

   San Diego County Office of Education

4. Available from:

   Lean King, Area Director, Educational Services Division, San Diego
   County Office of Education, 6401 Linda Vista Rd., San Diego, CA
   92111

5. Intended Purpose:

   This principal interview for elementary schools was used in the San Diego County Effective Schools Program to assess principal perceptions of effective school variables, school climate, and home-school relations. Results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate programs.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   Each of six scales are scored twice--once for assessment of the current state of the school and once for the importance of the factor in the school.

   (1) Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task--23 items

   Items in this scale ask about a wide range of teacher and student behaviors, the school mission, and the allocation of time for instruction. They ask about student involvement and responsibility, classroom management strategies, instructional strategies (including homework assignments and use of praise), and equal treatment of students.

Samples: "Do students from poorer families achieve as well as students from middle-class families?"

"Do high proportions of students hold positions of responsibility?"

"Do teachers provide rewards for actual achievement and praise students for work well done?"

"On the average, is reading/language arts scheduled for at least two hours a day in the elementary school?"

This group of items measures several distinct constructs.

(2) High Expectations--9 items

Questions ask about students' sense of control over their fate, teachers' use of rewards, equal opportunities for and treatment of all students, and students' mastery of curriculum.

Samples: "Do students believe that work is more important than luck in order to succeed?"

"Do teachers praise students for work well done?"

"Are all students provided approximately equal opportunity to respond and become involved in instruction?"

These items appear to measure more than one dimension.

(3) Clear School Mission--3 items

Three items ask about teacher planning activities and the school board's priorities.

Samples: "Do teachers, early in the year, plan for the content to be covered during the year?"

"Has the school board set student achievement as a major goal for the school system?"

This scale lacks face validity.

(4) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress--9 items

Questions ask about teacher monitoring and feedback to students, use of achievement test data, teacher accessibility to students, and teacher expectations for student success.

Samples: "Do teachers plan for and expect students to succeed?"

"Do teachers monitor students' performances and provide constructive feedback, as needed?"

(5) Instructional Leadership--11 items

Eight of the items in the scale ask about principal observation and evaluation of teachers and opportunities for professional development. Three others ask if teachers plan courses together, if their views are represented in school decision making, and about the teacher-to-student ratio.

Samples: "Does the principal regularly observe classroom instruction?"

"Have principal and staff received training in procedures of evaluating and supervising so that principal and staff know about the rules under which supervision and evaluation are conducted?"

"Do teachers have extensive contact with a limited number of students in several aspects of their education?"

(6) Safe and Orderly Environment--5 items

Questions ask about the clarity of standards for behavior and the consistency of rule enforcement, about punishment strategies and the presence of positive role models.

Sample: "Does the teacher consistently enforce the classroom rules and procedures so discipline problems are infrequent?"

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This interview appears to have been adapted from an instrument intended to measure different dimensions than are intended by the present users. No reliability or validity evidence is provided and half of the scales lack even face validity as measures of the dimensions implied by the scale names.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Effectiveness Program Survey: Student Questionnaire (1983), Project No. 5

2. Author(s):

Santa Clara County Office of Education

3. Institution:

Educational Development Center, Santa Clara County Office of Education

4. Available from:

Educational Development Center, Santa Clara County Office of Education, Mail Code 237, 100 Skyport Drive, San Jose, CA 95115

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire for grades 4-8 assesses student perceptions of school effectiveness factors. Results are used along with teacher and parent assessment results to help set priorities for the school for school improvement planning. It can also be used to provide information needed for the California state School Improvement Program, for Chapter 1 programs, and for program review in other federal programs.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

Some evidence of content and convergent/discriminant validity is presented (Weil, 1984).

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by a scoring service.

9. Content:

The materials we received described the scales and provided sample questions. We were unable to assess the face validity of the scales because we did not have a complete copy of the questionnaire.

(1) Protects Instructional Time

Sample: "My teacher acts as if our reading and math time are the most important part of our day and will not allow us to use this time for any other work."

(2) Homework

Sample: "In this school, how much homework are 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students usually supposed to do on school nights."

(3) Expectations for Student Success

Sample: "What kinds of grades does your teacher expect you to earn?"

(4) Success Rate

Sample: "The class is on to the next skill or topic before I have learned the first one really well."

(5) Student Motivation

Sample: "Students in my class think it's important to do well in school and learn a lot."

(6) Commitment to Education

Sample: "How far would you like to go in school?"

(7) Student Rewards and Recognition

Sample: "Last year or this year, did you have your name read out at a school awards assembly or large gathering for helping at school or good behavior?"

(8) Explanation, Feedback, and Monitoring

Sample: "When I'm working at my desk, it's hard to get help because the teacher usually gets stuck with one or two students."

(9) Support

Sample: "In my class, the teacher has something good to say about everyone's work, not just those who finish first or do the best work."

(10) Student-Student Cohesion

Sample: "Students in other classes are friendly to me."

(11) Teacher-Student Cohesion

Sample: "How much do you like your teacher?"

(12) Attachment to School

Sample: "Some people your age like going to school and some don't."

(13) Positive Peer Influence

Sample: "What would you do if some of your friends asked you to skip school with them?"

(14) Government Responsibility

Sample: "Students serve on school committees and groups that work on school problems or special events."

(15) School Safety

Sample: "How often are you afraid you will be beaten up at school?"

(16) Rules and Enforcement

Sample: "At this school, it seems that some students can break rules without anything happening to them."

(17) Classroom Management

Sample: "When students in my class finish their work early, they don't know what to do."

(18) Belief in a Moral Order

Sample: "Do you agree with this statement: "To do well in this school you have to do some things that are not right, like lying or cheating?"

(19) Principal Supportiveness

Sample: "How much does your principal do to make students feel that they are part of the whole school (such as having school fairs and outings)?"

(20) Home Social Environment

Sample: "When my parents disagree, we usually talk things out."

(21) Television

Sample: "Do your parents limit the time that you can watch television?"

(21) School Conduct

Sample: "During last year or this year, have you gotten into trouble with school officials for one of the following activities: Serious fighting, stealing, damaging school property?"

(23) Home Educational Environment

Sample: "How often do your parents bring a book home for you to read or take you to the library or bookstore?"

(24) Academic Self-Concept

Samples: "When I take tests, I forget things I really know."

"I am proud of my schoolwork."

"I try to be one of the best students in my class."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

From the sample questions, this appears to be a useful device for assessing student perceptions of effective school factors. This assessment program appears to have been carefully developed and integrates responses from parents, students, and teachers. Feedback with profiles and directions for interpreting the scores is provided. The scores compare a school with the mean and standard deviation of local schools with higher-than-expected achievement scores. Schools can compare parent, teacher, and student perceptions. Variables from all questionnaires are combined into four major dimensions which are broken down for subgroups within the school. Thus, schools can see whether a grade or ethnic group is above the "effective school band," within the "effective school band," or below the "effective school band."

No reliability evidence was provided, and validity evidence was lacking for some scales. The system's unwillingness to share full copies of the questionnaire made it impossible to evaluate the face validity of the scales. The two parts of the student questionnaire take 90 minutes to complete which might be considered excessive by some schools.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Effectiveness Program Survey: Parent Questionnaire (1983), Project No. 5

2. Author(s):

Santa Clara County Office of Education

3. Institution:

Educational Development Center, Santa Clara County Office of Education

4. Available from:

Educational Development Center, Santa Clara County Office of Education, Mail Code 237, 100 Skyport Drive, San Jose, CA 95115

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire for grades K-8 assesses parent perceptions of school effectiveness factors. Results are used along with teacher and student assessment results to help set priorities for school improvement planning. It can also be used to provide information needed for the California state School Improvement Program, for Chapter 1 programs, and for program review in other federal programs.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

Some evidence of content and convergent/discriminant validity is presented (Weil, 1984).

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by a scoring service.

9. Content:

The materials we received described the scales and provided sample questions. We were unable to assess the face validity of the scales because we did not have a complete copy of the questionnaire.

(1) Protects Instructional Time

Sample: "Parents at our school are discouraged from taking their child out for doctor and dentist appointments during reading and math."

(2) Homework

Sample: "My son/daughter's teacher seldom assigns homework."

(3) Success Rate

Sample: "My child complains that schoolwork is too hard and often brings home papers with more than a few mistakes."

(4) Expectations for Student Success

Sample: "Students in this school are expected to work hard."

(5) Monitoring Student Progress-Communication

Sample: "After my child takes standardized achievement tests, I am aware of his scores."

(6) Teacher-Parent Communication

Samples: "My child's teacher regularly sends home classwork for me to review."

"Does your child's teacher suggest ways in which you can help your child with his/her homework?"

(7) Parent Involvement

Sample: "How would you describe your involvement in school committees, parent associations or other school organizations?"

(8) Effective Instruction Monitoring

Sample: "My child's teacher knows exactly which reading and math skills my child understands and which ones he/she still needs to learn."

(9) Expectations and Standards Performance

Sample: "At this school, students are moved on to the next grade even if they have not learned the basic skills."

(10) School Safety

Sample: "At this school, how much of a problem is damage to school property by the students?"

(11) Classroom Management

Sample: "My son/daughter's teacher establishes class rules for students to follow."

(12) Leadership Climate—Entrepreneurship

Sample: "At our school the principal lets us know what the school expects from our children."

(13) Collaborative Organizational Climate—Decision Making

Sample: "I have a chance to contribute to important decisions that are made at my child's school."

(14) Collaborative Organizational Climate—Communication

Sample: "How satisfied are you with the way the principal makes important decisions at your child's school?"

(15) Parent Satisfaction

Sample: "My child is challenged to his/her capacity in school."

(16) Home Educational Environment

Sample: "How many hours of television does your child watch on a weekday."

(17) Home Social Environment

Sample: "When there is a disagreement between you and your child, do you usually talk things out?"

(18) Parent Attitude Toward Education

Sample: "How much school would you like your son/daughter to complete before he/she stops school and works full time?"

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

From the sample questions, this appears to be a useful device for assessing parent perceptions of effective school factors. This assessment program appears to have been carefully developed and integrates responses from parents, students, and teachers. Feedback with profiles and directions for interpreting the scores is provided. The scores compare a school with the mean and standard deviation of local schools with higher-than-expected achievement scores. Schools can compare parent, teacher, and student perceptions. Variables from all questionnaires are combined into four major dimensions which are broken down for subgroups within the school. Thus, schools can see whether a grade or ethnic group is above the "effective school band," within the "effective school band," or below the "effective school band."

No reliability evidence was provided, and validity evidence was lacking for some scales. The system's unwillingness to share full copies of the questionnaire made it impossible to evaluate the face validity of the instruments.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Survey: Teacher Questionnaire (1983), Project No. 5

2. Author(s):

   Santa Clara County Office of Education

3. Institution:

   Educational Development Center, Santa Clara County Office of Education

4. Available from:

   Educational Development Center, Santa Clara County Office of Education, Mail Code 237, 100 Skyport Drive, San Jose, CA 95115.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This questionnaire for grades K-8 assesses teacher perceptions of school effectiveness factors. Results are used along with parent and student assessment results to help set priorities for school improvement planning. It can also be used to provide information needed for the California state School Improvement Program, for Chapter 1 programs, and for program review in other federal programs.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   Some evidence of content, convergent/discriminant, and experimental validity is presented (Weil, 1984).

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by a scoring service.

9. Content:

   The materials we received described the scales and provided sample questions. We were unable to assess the face validity of the scales because we did not have a complete copy of the questionnaire.

   (1) Protects Instructional Time

   Sample: "The principal establishes policies which ensure that instructional time is not interrupted with non-instructional matters."

(2) Allocated Time

Sample: "Is there a schoolwide policy that at least fifty minutes or more is allocated for math instruction each day?"

(3) Homework

"On a typical school night about how much homework do you usually assign?"

(4) Success Rate

Sample: "After you have explained a new skill or concept in reading or math, what level of accuracy are most students able to attain when they practice at their desk?"

(5) Expectations for Student Success

Sample: "How many students in your class(es) do you feel are capable of getting mostly A's and B's, if they work really hard?"

(6) Alignment with Testing Materials

Sample: "The principal makes sure that content of textbooks is closely coordinated with the achievement tests used at this school."

(7) Alignment with Instruction

Sample: "At my school, there is an identified set of objectives or skills in reading and math at each grade level."

(8) Clear School Mission

Sample: "At this school, there is a written statment of purpose that is the driving force behind most important decisions."

(9) Performance Standards

Sample: "At this school, student promotion is based on scholastic achievement rather than the time spent at one grade level."

(10) Student Motivation

Sample: "How many students in your class(es) care about their grades and work hard to get good grades?"

(11) Teacher Efficacy

Measures teachers' belief in their ability to achieve results with students.

Sample: "When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment."

(12) Teacher-Teacher Cohesion

Sample: "There is real professional sharing and support among the faculty at this school."

(13) Teacher-Student Cohesion

Sample: "At this school, teachers and students treat each other with respect."

(14) Governance and Responsibility

Sample: "To what extent does this school provide oppotunities for students to take on responsibilities in addition to their classwork?"

(15) School Safety

Sample: "Student behavior is a general problem at this school."

(16) Rules and Discipline (or Rules and Safety)

Sample: "There is a clear set of school rules which is reviewed and updated regularly."

(17) Classroom Management

Sample: "In your class(es) about how many students waste time before getting down to work?"

(18) Promotes Instructional Improvement

Samples: "How often does the principal bring instructional issues to the faculty for discussion?"

"How often after formal observations by the principal does a plan (for) improvement follow?"

(19) Principal Supportiveness

Samples: "The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal."

"If a child is a behavior problem in my class, I know I can count on the principal to help out."

(20) Entrepreneurship

Sample: "The principal is able to bring different groups within the school together to work for a common cause or task."

(21) Effective Instruction

Samples: "It is important to explain new material quickly to the whole class so that more time can be spent working on an individual basis with students who are having problems."

"While I'd like my students to know how they do each day on their reading and math work, I can only evaluate and discuss their individual progress once a week or so."

(22) Systematic Monitoring of Student Progress

Sample: "The principal leads frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement."

(23) Use of Monitoring of Student Progress

Sample: "The principal and teachers at this school make use of student test data for curriculum and instructional planning."

(24) Student Rewards and Recognition

Sample: "To what extent does this school reward or recognize students for good behavior, service, and participation in intramural activities?"

(25) Home-School Relationships

Sample: "This school has a written statement that clearly communicates what the school expects parents to do to help their child with his or her learning at home and at school."

(26) Decisionmaking

Sample: "In our school, conflict situations are confronted and mutually acceptable solutions are arranged."

(27) Group Process

Sample: "Group meetings in this school (such as staff, program, or committee meetings) are well organized."

(28) Communication

Samples: "When the principal visits your classroom, how useful is his/her feedback to you?"

"At this school, teachers often feel that important issues and problems facing the school are not shared with them."

(29) Job Satisfaction

Sample: "How satisfied are you with your current work at this school?"

(30) Structural Staff Development-Goal Related

Sample: "At this school, staff development is an important part of achieving our school's instructional goals and is closely linked to our instructional program."

(31) Structural Staff Development-Operationalized

Sample: "At this school the principal and teachers make a concerted effort to implement ideas and techniques discussed during in-service activities."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This assessment program appears to have been carefully developed and integrates responses from parents, students, and teachers. Feedback with profiles and directions for interpreting the scores is provided. The scores compare a school with the mean and standard deviation of local schools with higher-than-expected achievement scores. Schools can compare parent, teacher, and student perceptions. Variables from all questionnaires are combined into four major dimensions which are broken down for subgroups within the school. Thus, schools can see whether a grade or ethnic group is above the "effective school band," within the "effective school band," or below the "effective school band."

No reliability evidence was provided, and validity evidence was lacking for some scales. The system's unwillingness to share full copies of the questionnaire made it impossible to evaluate the face validity of the instruments.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Indicators of Quality Schools--Instrument to Assess the Educational Quality of Your School (1982), Project No. 6

2. Author(s):

William C. Dean, Eugene R. Howard, Kathryn De Pew, Robert Ewy, Joan Harrigan, James Hennes, Thomas Knauer, Sister Alan Thomas, Gerald Villars

3. Institution:

School Improvement and Leadership Services Unit, Colorado Department of Education

4. Available from:

Eugene Howard, Colorado Dept. of Education, 201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used by the Colorado Dept. of Education's School Improvement and Leadership Services Unit to assess K-12 staff perceptions of school effectiveness and climate variables. Informed pupils and parents are sometimes asked to contribute to the assessment. Assessment results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Can be hand-scored or machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Curricular Congruency--13 items

Items ask about the congruence of the achievement tests and teaching materials used with the curriculum, the clarity of the learning objectives, teacher use of the curriculum documents, and the process of curriculum revision.

Sample: "Tests have been analyzed and selected to match the school's objectives."

(2) Assessment--16 items

Items cover characteristics of the testing program and the student achievement tests used, the use of evaluation for assessing school improvement efforts, whether or not affective student outcomes are assessed, whether or not the school follows up on dropout and graduates, and the school's uses of assessment data.

Samples: "Feedback is obtained from the public, parents, colleges, and employees on the quality of students' and graduates' job performance."

"Test scores are compared with expected scores appropriate to the students."

(3) Leadership of the Principal--18 items

General items report about the charisma of the principal, the staff development program, support for teacher experimentation, communication, accessibility and responsiveness, the existence of standards for learning, discipline and school improvement, autonomy, use of rewards, and relations with the community.

Sample: "The principal takes a position on issues and is not seen as being unfairly influenced by others."

(4) High Expectations--13 items

Items ask about teachers' and administrators' expectations for student achievement for all students and school practices for rewarding, praising, and recognizing students.

Sample: "Student projects are featured in school newspapers and/or newsletters."

(5) School-Wide Norms, Values, Practices and Policies--9 items

Items ask about student and teacher participation in school decision making, the clarity and consistency of enforcement of school policies, the grading policy for remedial classes, and the accessibility of individual students' test data to teachers.

Sample: "Administrators and staff enforce the school absenteeism and tardiness policy and consistently follow-up on noncompliance."

(6) School Climate--39 items

This set of items uses the CFK Ltd Profile items for Respect, Trust, Morale, Cohesiveness and Caring. Items in these sections appear to measure the dimensions implied by their labels, and account for slightly more than half of the items. Two new sections ask about approachability of staff, general liking for the school, responsiveness of the staff to student needs, opportunity for student input in school decision making, respect for property, and reports about indicators of school success such as attendance, dropout and suspension rates, and student achievement. Questions also ask about participation in extracurricular activities and whether or not cliques get along.

Samples (from sections not taken from the CFK instrument): "There is a general expectation that students will take care of their own property and the property of others."

"The school drop-out rate is low."

"The buildings and grounds are in good repair and show evidence of upkeep."

(7) Monitoring and Feedback of Student Progress--11 items

Includes items about the utility of test for providing teachers and students with information relevant to mastery of specific objectives, teacher practices of monitoring student progress and providing feedback, and school practices of providing parents with feedback on student performance.

Sample: "The curriculum is defined in useful units or "chunks" and the progress of students in mastering these units is reported to students and parents."

(8) Time on Task--11 items

Includes items about teacher practices that are expected to increase the amount of time students are engaged in learning activities with a high level of success and items about the extent of distractions that potentially rob instructional time.

Samples: "Announcements are handled so as to minimize disruptions."

"Teachers diagnose which teaching techniques promote or detract from high rates of student engagement and success."

(9) Organization and Management of the Instructional Setting--19 items

Items ask about teacher practices aimed at clarifying rules and procedures, the presence or absence of an explicit and consistently enforced discipline policy, teacher use of sound behavior management strategies, grouping practices, and teacher practices to promote independent study among students.

Sample: "Students are encouraged to work independently or with others with a minimum of direct adult supervision."

This scale lacks face validity.

(10) Instructional Effectiveness--18 items

Includes items about teacher expectations as evidenced by certain practices (e.g., starting sessions on time, not wasting time), teacher practices regarding homework, student-teacher interaction, and teacher questioning strategies.

Samples: "Teachers ask questions at a level where the student addressed is challenged yet likely to be successful."

"Learning activities in this school demand active student participation."

(11) Parent Involvement--14 items

Items ask about parental support for their children's educational activities, teacher practices of parent involvement, parent and community involvement in school decision making, parent volunteers in the school, school programs to provide students with practical experiences in the community, business-education partnerships.

Sample: "Community participation at school events is good."

(12) Accountability/Accreditation/Planning Process--18 items

Items ask about school and district-level use of assessment information to set priorities, the existence of action plans at the district and school level, the coordination of district and school-level plans, the level of implementation of improvement plans, use of evaluation data for school improvement, and community relations.

Sample: "Priority setting occurs at both the district and individual school level."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This instrument is comprehensive and carefully constructed. The authors attempted to base the measures on research documenting the importance of each domain, and a great deal of practical experience in schools seems to have informed the item development process. The materials are straightforward and instructions for administering and interpreting them are clear.

The review of literature on effective schools that formed the basis for at least some of the item choices is incomplete and generally not helpful in specifying the domain. There is a high degree of overlap among the different item sets, and many of the item sets measure several dimensions. Item analyses would help to eliminate bad items and shorten the instrument considerably. Validation studies are necessary.

11. Comments:

This instrument actually yields 24 scores--one set describes the current situation and another the "impact potential" in that area.

See Guzzetti (1983) for an earlier assessment. That evaluation concurred with ours in identifying the lack of information about the psychometric properties of the measure as problematical. Guzzetti also pointed out that the items sometimes reflect the author's assumptions about good educational practices rather than sound research. Also, the responses may be biased by the positive slant of the items and the introductory paragraphs. Some items appear "double-barreled," and some items appear inappropriate for parents and students.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Mini-Audit No. 1: Activities and Projects for Climate Improvement Program Determinants; Mini-Audit No. 2: Process and Material Determinants (1980), Project No. 6

2. Author(s):

   Eugene Howard

3. Institution:

   Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

4. Available from:

   ASCD, 225 N. Washington St., Alexandria, Va 22314

5. Intended Purpose:

   This questionnaire for teachers and administrators in grades K-12 assesses staff perceptions about school effectiveness and climate and process variables. Results are used in setting priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Can be hand or machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   (1) Active Learning--8 items

   Items ask about use of nontraditional learning materials and activities in the classroom and school that promote active participation

   Samples: "Use of manipulative materials in the classroom: Models, machines, scales, live plants, measuring devices, scientific apparatus, blocks or rods for learning math, photographic and recording equipment."

   "Integration of the arts into the curriculum."

(2) Individualized Performance Expectations/Varied Reward Systems--5 items

These items ask about individualized curricular assignments and projects and the use of nontraditional reward and grading systems.

Sample: "Students in the same class or learning group are not necessarily given the same assignments . . ."

(3) Varied Learning Environments, and Flexible Curricular and Extra Curricular Activities--15 items

Items ask about the use of out-of-school resources for learning experiences, the physical management of the classroom and school, the variety of learning options available, the extracurricular activities program.

Samples: "Artist or poet in school programs."

"A noon-hour activities program."

(4) Appropriate Support and Structure--7 items

These items ask about programs to provide affective support and training in nonacademic areas for students. One item asks about the availability of instructional materials.

Samples: "Leadership training courses or units for students."

"Special Education programs of all types."

(5) Rules Cooperatively Determined--3 items

These items ask about staff and student involvement in the generation of school and classroom rules.

Sample: "Student involvement in defining rules in classrooms."

(6) Problem Solving, Decision Making, and Resolving Conflict--7 items

These items ask about the existence of formal structures and procedures to involve staff, students and parents in identifying school problems and solving them.

Sample: "Conflict resolution committees . . . are organized to identify growing conflicts among cliques or individuals and to resolve such conflicts before they become disruptive to the school."

(7) Improvement of School Goals and Planning for the Future--6 items

Includes items about the use of evaluation data to identify areas of weakness and the existence of and implementation of written school improvement plans.

Sample: "Procedures have been established for involving parents, pupils, and staff in defining school improvement priorities."

(8) Effective Communications--13 items

Most of the items in this group ask about school practices to promote communication between parents and the school. Some items ask similar questions about communication between groups within the school.

Sample: "The social structure (clique structure) of the school is studied and activities are planned to open communications among various cliques which are isolated from one another."

(9) Autonomy with Accountability--7 items

Items ask about the extent to which different groups assume responsibility.

Samples: "Task forces assume responsibility for working on school improvement activities or projects."

"Students assume responsibility for improving their own behavior through behavior contracts."

This scale lacks face validity.

(10) Effective Teaching/Learning Strategies--9 items

Items ask about the following teacher practices: grouping strategies, use of independent study, feedback to students about the quality of their work, individualized assignments, use of time, use of "active learning" activities.

Sample: "Teachers systematically use diagnostic and prescriptive techniques to determine learning needs of individual pupils and assign learning tasks related to those needs."

(11) Adequate Resources--5 items

Items ask about the adequacy of learning materials and equipment and whether the school makes use of community resources.

Sample: "Learning materials and equipment in individual classrooms are adequate."

(12) Supportive and Efficient Logistical Systems--5 items

Questions ask about the efficiency of procedures to obtain materials.

Sample: "A local or regional film library fills orders efficiently and promptly."

(13) Suitability of School Plant--8 items

Questions ask about physical conditions in the school.

Samples: "School plant flexibility is encouraged by providing folding or movable partitions."

"The school site has been extended to include a school farm or outdoor education camp."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The general areas addressed in the mini-audits have user-appeal. They are based on work completed by a group of educational administrators and reported in School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator (Fox, 1976). The mini-audits are widely used. They are easy to complete and the results are easily interpreted.

Although most of the items have face validity as determinants of positive school climate, no validity evidence is presented. Many items suggest school or classroom practices that appear inconsistent with the research on effective schools and classroom practices. Without evidence to back up the validity of these items for measuring determinants of positive school climate, the utility of the measures is questionable.

11. Comments:

This instrument actually yields 26 scores--one set describes the current situation and another the "impact potential" in that area.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

A School for the Eighties and Nineties: A Priority Search (1983), Project No. 6

2. Author(s):

Eugene Howard (Editor), Roscoe Davidson, Eric Eversley, Joseph Flierel, Harvey Hoffman, Michael Massarotti, Gary Price, Jim Sekich, Bonnie Walters, and Carol Wilson

3. Institution:

Colorado Department of Education

4. Available from:

Eugene R. Howard, Colorado Department of Education, 201 E. Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire is primarily for high school teachers to assess their opinions about content of the instructional program and organizational and instructional processes in the school. Assessment results were used to help schools define an "image of the future" and develop a vision statement as a focus for school improvement activities in the School Improvement Through Leagues and Clusters program in Colorado.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Can be hand-scored or machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Content of the Instructional Program--13 items

Questions ask about the adequacy of the instructional program for preparing students in basic skills as well as in technical areas (math and science, computers), social issues (nuclear warfare, distribution of wealth), psychological health, interpersonal and management skills.

Sample: "Each year students are provided with substantial learning experiences designed to encourage the growth of their aesthetic capacity, i.e., the ability to create and appreciate beauty."

(2) The Instructional Process and Teachers' Role--3 items

Items ask about the extent to which students have a personalized education plan providing for a variety of learning experiences and about the teacher's role as facilitator.

Samples: "The school is organized in such a way that pupils learn in places outside of as well as within the school."

"Learning from people who are not professional teachers as well as from teachers is encouraged."

(3) The Learning Community and Lifelong Learning--3 items

Questions ask about the role of the school in providing a range of services to the community appropriate for all stages of development from age two through adulthood.

Sample: "The school has become a learning community in which staff, student, parent, and other community members are involved in their own and mutual learning activities."

(4) Governance and Institutional Self-Renewal--3 items

Items ask about the process of planning and decision making in the school.

Sample: "Provision is made for on-going dialog among staff, students, parents, and other community leaders regarding the purpose of schooling and the nature of the learning process."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The questionnaire items are based on a careful review of a specific literature and were judged by experts on that literature to reflect the major concepts included in the literature.

Apart from the content validity evidence cited above, the instrument was not validated. We do not know how well the items actually measure the constructs they set out to measure. The scope of the items is narrow compared to many other assessment devices included in our study.

11. Comments:

This instrument actually yields eight scores--one set describes the current situation in each of the four areas and the other describes what should be.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Describing Your School's Characteristics (DYSC, 1984), Project No. 7

2. Author(s):

   Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL)

3. Institution:

   Same as above

4. Available from:

   McREL, 2600 S. Parker Rd., Building 5, Suite 353, Aurora, CO 80014,
   (303) 337-0990.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This instrument was used to assess elementary, intermediate, or high school teachers' and principals' perceptions about school effectiveness and process variables. Assessment results provided a basis for setting priorities for school improvement and for identifying areas where high disagreement existed.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by McREL.

9. Content:

   (1) Expectations for Success--7 items

   Items ask about the level of difficulty of work given, clarity of instructions and objectives, emphasis on student success, equal treatment of students, and the principal's standards for academic achievement.

   Samples: "I give academic assignments on which anyone can be successful, regardless of his or her reading ability."

   "I have minimum standards for each student which I expect that student to achieve."

   This scale lacks face validity.

(2) Diagnosis/Prescription--7 items

Two of the seven items ask about diagnostics and prescriptions designed to match instructional tasks to student needs. Five items ask about standardization of instructional objectives, planning instructional units, and assessing mastery of objectives.

Samples: "When planning instruction, I refer to a sequence or specific set of skills or behaviors which students are expected to accomplish."

"The principal has established a policy for providing easy access to student academic records to help me diagnose student needs."

This scale lacks face validity.

(3) Effective Instruction

These items ask about the use of effective questioning strategies, strategies to ensure high success rates for students, the use of explicit criteria for evaluating student work, monitoring during seatwork, level of student involvement, and use of a variety of teaching techniques.

Sample: "During oral question periods, I phrase questions at different difficulty levels so all students can be successful."

(4) Use of Time

Items ask about use of classroom time for noninstructional tasks, teacher enforcement of school attendance policies, student engagement rate and rate of success, and classroom management.

Samples: "All of my students are engaged for a minimum of 80% of the instructional period."

"I plan management activities, such as distribution of materials, to maximize instructional time."

(5) Knowledge of Outcomes

Questions ask primarily about methods for assessing student progress and feedback to students about their progress.

Samples: "At this school there is an annual process for deciding in which areas of the curriculum students are successful and in which areas they need improvement."

"I give students continuous information about how well they are learning."

(6) Rewards and Praise

Questions ask about school and classroom practices to provide rewards to staff and students and recognition for effort, accomplishments, and good performance.

Sample: "Staff members are regularly praised/rewarded/recognized for their instructional improvement efforts."

"When I praise a student, I do so immediately after the praised behavior occurs and mention that specific behavior in my praise."

(7) Management

Questions ask about discipline policies, teacher-student relations, and the physical condition of the building.

Samples: "I spend time with students who want to discuss personal concerns and problems."

"This building is well cared for--the floors are cleaned, broken windows are replaced immediately, and other maintenance of the school is done regularly."

(8) Collegiality

Questions ask about collegiality and cooperation among teachers.

Samples: "I cooperatively develop with other teachers learning activities or instructional units."

"I am encouraged to try out new instructional strategies without risk."

(9) Parental Involvement

Questions ask about the extent to which teachers communicate with parents about their childrens' progress and parent involvement with school activities.

Samples: "Parents visit my classrooms."

"Parents attend parent-teacher conferences to discuss their child's academic progress."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Seven of the nine scales appear to measure what is intended. This device is easy to use and an inexpensive scoring service is provided. However, no evidence of reliability or validity is provided. Without such evidence it is difficult to know whether the differences in the raw scores are meaningful. The coding scheme used to score the instruments assigns the lowest value to "Don't know." Therefore, areas with the least clarity or visibility are presented in the results as most in need of improvement.

11. Comments:

This instrument is no longer being disseminated by McREL. They are currently developing a new instrument that will be similar in format to DYSC. The new instrument and information about its psychometric properties will be available by September, 1986.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Academic Efficiency Index Instrument (1986), Project No. 7

2. Author(s):

   Robert J. Marzano and C. L. Hutchins

3. Institution:

   Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL)

4. Available from:

   McREL, 2600 S. Parker Rd., Building 5, Suite 353, Aurora, CO 80014,
   (303) 337-0990.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This instrument is used to assess efficient time use. It assesses the school's absenteeism rate, time lost to non-instructional school and class activities and time lost to student inattentiveness. One form of the assessment also assesses student success rates. The results are intended to be used as a basis for setting priorities for school improvement and for tracking improvements in time use.

6. Reliability Information:

   None reported.

7. Validity Information:

   Content validity is based on prior time-on-task research showing a relationship between allocated and engaged time and achievement.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Absenteeism and time lost to non-instructional school activities are assessed by a group of teachers using a worksheet to calculate percentages of the total school day allocated for various non-instructional activities and the average percentage of students attending school each day.

   Time lost to noninstructional classroom activities is assessed by an observer spending 20 to 30 minutes in approximately one-third to one-half the school's classrooms (but at least 10). The observer counts minutes lost to noninstructional activities, and these counts are averaged across classrooms to obtain an estimate for the entire school.

Three alternative methods--two observational and one student self-report--are provided for assessing student engagement rate. Observation data are collected at the same time and in the same classrooms as the non-instructional classroom activities data are collected (see above). One method calls for observing all students in the classroom, and the other calls for observing high and low achieving students to obtain the total engaged rate as well as the difference between the two groups. The self-report method asks students to report periodically whether or not they understood the material. These data are used to calculate a "success rate." As with the noninstructional classroom activities observations, these student observations are averaged across observed classrooms to arrive at a school-level summary score.

The four school-level scores are used to construct an "academic efficiency grid"--a visual tool useful for identifying areas in which intervention would most likely yield improvement in use of instructional time.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This device appears to measure a very important dimension in a fairly simple manner. Instructions for calculating each index and for performing classroom observations are clear. However, more explicit guidance about the sampling of classrooms and the number required to yield a reliable estimate would greatly increase the utility of the device. Also, norms for the different indices are provided, but are not discussed in the text, and the text discourages comparison across schools.

11. Comments:

For an earlier assessment of the instrument, see Guzzetti (1983). This device was excluded from analyses in the main body of this report because it is an observation instrument.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview (1981), Elementary, Middle School Level, Project No. 8

2. Author(s):

Principal Author: Robert Villanova; Co-Authors: William J. Gauthier, Jr., C. Patrick Proctor, Joan Shoemaker, Herman A. Sirois, Martin Gotowala

3. Institution:

Connecticut State Department of Education

4. Available from:

Raymond Pecheone or Joan Shoemaker, State Department of Education,
P. O. Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145

5. Intended Purpose:

Interviews are used to assess the perceptions of elementary and middle school teachers, principals, and staff regarding school effectiveness and climate variables. The results are used to set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the seven scales range from .66 to .93 (average = .77). No retest reliabilities are provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

The method for developing the items and information on content, convergent, and construct validity is presented in the Handbook for Use of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire, Connecticut Department of Education, 1984.

8. Scoring:

The results can be machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Safe and Orderly Environment--5 items (alpha = .66)

The items in this measure are concerned with school safety, discipline, the general condition of the building, and the learning atmosphere.

Samples: "Is this school a safe and secure place to work?"

"Describe the disciplinary climate in this school."

"Who assumes responsibility for discipline in this school?"

"Describe the general condition of the physical plant and upkeep of the school."

(2) Clear School Mission--11 items (alpha = .93)

The items in this measure seek information on whether there is a clearly defined school mission that guides the instructional program (in Reading, Language Arts, and Math).

Samples: "Is there a written statement of purpose for this school that guides the instructional program?"

"In the area of Reading, is there a set of written, sequential objectives in this school up through all grades?"

"To what extent do teachers use these objectives in Reading to guide their instruction?"

"In Reading, is there a set of skills that all students are expected to master at each grade level?"

(3) Instructional Leadership--14 items (alpha = .81)

The items in this measure are concerned with the performance of the principal.

Samples: "Describe the instructional leadership in this school."

"To what extent does the principal promote the discussion of instructional improvement?"

"How often does the principal make formal classroom observations?"

"To what extent does the principal promote or manage staff development in relation to instructional improvement?"

"To what degree does the principal arrange for coordination of the instructional program within and between grades?"

(4) High Expectations--10 items (alpha = .69)

The items in this measure deal with staff expectations concerning students' performance/achievement. That is, how well do they expect a student to master basic skills? What factors do they think influence student achievement (home background, discipline, grouping for math and reading)?

Samples: "Typically, what percentage of students are expected to master basic skills at each grade level?"

"In general, how would you describe the expectation of teachers in this school regarding student achievement?"

"To what extent is the number of low-income children retained in grade different from the number of other children retained in grade in this school?"

(5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task--9 items (alpha = .78)

The items in this measure deal with the amount of time spent for learning reading, language arts, and math, how time for basic skills is allotted in the school, what interferes or interrupts classroom instruction, performance on assigned work, and how classroom instruction occurs.

Samples: "How much time is spent in your classroom on Reading/Language Arts each day?"

"To what extent do students disrupt instruction during classes in this school?"

"Following instruction, how do students typically perform on assigned practice work?"

(6) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress--8 items (alpha = .86)

The items in this measure deal with how and how often student progress in basic skills are monitored and how that information is utilized. Items also ask about standardized and criterion-referenced programs.

Samples: "Describe the standardized testing program in this school."

"Describe the use of standardized test results in this school."

The convergent/discriminant validity evidence provided for this scale suggests that it may not measure a separable dimension.

(7) Home-School Relations--10 items (alpha = .66)

Items ask about the amount of parent involvement, the type of parent organization, communication between teachers and parents, and parents' rule in school homework policy.

Samples: "To what extent are parents involved in this school?"

"Describe the ways in which parents and teachers communicate in this school."

"Beyond formal conferences, how many teacher contacts do parents initiate during a typical month?"

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This assessment device appears to have been carefully developed based on effective schools research. It is accompanied by a manual describing the instrument, its development, use, administration, validity, and reliability. It is inexpensive to use. The multiple choice format makes it easier to score than open-ended questions.

The reliability and validity evidence is calculated using the individual rather than the school as the unit of analysis.

11. Comments:

For an earlier assessment of this instrument, see Guzzetti (1983). The instrument has been revised since the Guzzetti review.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (1981), Project No. 8

2. Author(s):

Principal Author: Robert M. Villanova; Co-authors: William J. Gauthier, Jr., C. Patrick Proctor, Joan Shoemaker

3. Institution:

Connecticut Department of Education

4. Available from:

Raymond Pecheone or Joan Shoemaker, Connecticut State Department of Education, P. O. Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145 (203) 566-7163.

5. Intended Purpose:

The questionnaire is used to assess the perceptions of elementary and middle school teachers, principals, and staff regarding school effectiveness and climate variables. The results are used to set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the seven scales range from .66 to .93 (average = .80). Ten-day test-retest reliabilities range from .67 to .90 (average = .70).

7. Validity Information:

A panel of experts familiar with the effective schools research reviewed all items. Using a Q-sort technique, panel members sorted items into the seven categories. Items miscategorized 20% of the time or more were eliminated. Correlations between questionnaire and interview scales provided some evidence of convergent and discriminant validity, although some of the correlations suggested that the seven constructs were not distinct.

8. Scoring:

Results can be machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Safe and Orderly Environment--10 items (alpha = .85)

Items ask about the school's atmosphere, the safety of the area, the maintenance of the school building, if student behavior is positive, and if teachers and administrators assume responsibility for school discipline.

Samples: "This school is a safe and secure place to work."

"Student behavior is generally positive in this school."

(2) Clear School Mission--14 items (alpha = .90)

Items ask if there are written objectives that guide Reading, Math, and Language Arts that students must master at each grade level as well as overall school objectives which influence instructional programs.

Samples: "In reading, written sequential objectives exist up through all grades."

"A written statement of purpose that is the driving force behind most important decisions does not exist in this school."

(3) Instructional Leadership--25 items (alpha = .83)

Items ask about principal visibility throughout the school, communications with teachers about instructional practices, reviews of test results to plan for school improvement, formal observation of the classroom with postobservation conference, and promoting staff development activities.

Samples: "The principal makes frequent formal classroom observations."

"The principal frequently communicates to individual teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement."

"There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in this school."

(4) High Expectations--12 items (alpha = .69)

Items ask what percentage of students can be expected to master all basic skills, about teacher responsibility for student achievement, and what factors (such as low-income, home background, disciplinary problems) might affect their expectations.

"In this school low-achieving students present more discipline problems than other students."

"90-100% of students are expected to master all basic skills at every grade level."

(5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task--12 items (alpha = .74)

Items deal with the amount of time allotted for reading, language arts, and math, the format for daily lessons, class atmosphere, whether pullout programs disrupt or interfere with basic skills, monitoring of assigned seatwork, and if special instructional programs are integrated with curriculum and classroom instruction for individual students.

Samples: "Two hours or more are allocated for reading/language arts each day throughout this school."

"Typical daily lessons in this school follow this sequence: teacher presentation, student practice, specific feedback, evaluation of student performance."

(6) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress--12 items (alpha = .67)

Items ask about use of criterion-referenced and standardized tests for planning program modifications and about daily feedback to students about their work.

Samples: "Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school."

"Standardized test results are available and are used to evaluate program objectives."

The convergent/discriminant validity evidence provided for this scale suggests that it may not measure a separable dimension.

(7) Home-School Relations--15 items (alpha = .82)

Questions ask about parent-home interaction, parents' rating of the school, and parent monitoring of homework. Items also cover teacher-home communication and parent initiation of school contact and understanding and support for the instructional program.

Samples: "Homework is monitored at home and in school with follow-up."

"There is an active parent/school group in this school that involves many parents."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This assessment device appears to have been carefully developed based on effective schools research. It is accompanied by a manual describing the instrument, its development, use, administration, validity, and reliability. It is inexpensive to use. The multiple choice format makes it easier to score than open-ended questions.

The reliability and validity evidence is calculated using the individual rather than the school as the unit of analysis.

11. Comments:

For an earlier assessment of this instrument, see Guzzetti (1983). The instrument has been revised since the Guzzetti review.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Staff Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 8

2. Author(s):

   Principal Author: Alice Evans

3. Institution:

   Connecticut State Department of Education

4. Available from:

   Alice Evans, School Effectiveness Unit, Bureau of School and Program Development, Division of Educational Support Services, State Department of Education, Hartford, CT 06145

5. Intended Purpose:

   Surveys are used to assess the perceptions of secondary school teachers, principals, and staff regarding school effectiveness and climate variables. The results are used to set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   The measures of school effectiveness are based largely on a content analysis of the effective schools literature. Content validity for seven of the twelve measures is described in the Handbook for Use of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire, Connecticut Department of Education, 1984.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   (1) Decision-making--9 items

   Questions ask about the existence of standard practices for solving school problems, bias for action, and input into decision making from students and staff.

   Sample: "Important decisions are made in this school with representation from students, faculty and administration."

(2) Consideration--12 items

Most questions ask about teacher morale, cooperation, and support. One question asks about teacher respect for students, two about teacher praise and positive feedback to students, one about opportunities for students and staff to work together, and one about the principal's style.

Samples: "There is a 'we' spirit in this school."

"Students are praised for good performance."

"The principal talks with us frankly and openly."

The intended construct is defined as "respect and trust . . . among staff and between staff and students." The staff-student aspect appears not well-covered in this set of items.

(3) Academic Press--11 items

Questions ask about the academic climate in the school: homework assignment and completion, student attendance and preparedness, student effort and enthusiasm for learning, recognition of academic success, and student mobility.

Samples: "Students stay away from school only for good reasons."

"The climate in this school promotes learning."

(4) Academic Growth and Renewal--5 items

Questions ask about opportunities for professional development, master-teacher arrangements, whether or not teachers are held accountable and whether or not teachers know how to teach.

Samples: "Teachers in this school are held accountable for providing learning opportunities for each of their classes."

"In-service education programs are available to teachers to help them keep up-to-date on the best teaching strategies."

(5) Safe and Orderly Environment--11 items

The items in this measure are concerned with school safety, discipline, the physical condition of the building, and the learning atmosphere.

Samples: "This school is a safe and secure place to work."

"Teachers, administrators, and parents assume responsibility for discipline in this school."

(6) Clear School Mission--5 items

Questions ask about the existence of written norms for behavior, availability of instructional materials, instructional goal consensus, and the consistency of student recognition with the school's primary goals.

Samples: "The school has published statements of expectations and norms for the conduct of staff and students."

"Teachers and students are able to get the instructional materials they need at the time they are needed."

(7) Instructional Leadership--10 items

Questions ask about principal behaviors that reflect a concern for improving the instructional program.

Samples: "Formal observations by the principal are followed regularly by a post-observation conference."

"The principal uses test results to recommend modifications or changes in the instructional program."

(8) High Expectations--8 items

The items in this measure ask about staff expectations concerning students' performance, teacher accountability for student performance, and teacher praise.

Samples: "If students haven't acquired the basic skills by the time they get to this level, there is little our staff can do to help them."

"Teachers praise all students for their accomplishments rather than praise only those who accomplish the most."

(9) Frequent Monitoring of Pupils' Progress--6 items

The items in this measure ask about how and how often student progress is monitored, about feedback to students, and about the use of test results to modify the instructional program.

Samples: "When students are assigned seatwork, teachers monitor their efforts closely."

"Specific feedback on daily assignments is given to students regularly and is followed up by the teacher."

"Teachers and their supervisors thoroughly review and analyze test results to plan instructional program modifications."

(10) Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task--7 items

Questions ask about whether the atmosphere is conducive to learning, what interferes or interrupts classroom instruction, effective use of time allocated to instruction, and student success rates.

Samples: "Basic skills instructional time rarely is interrupted."

"Teachers start classes on time and continue teaching to the final bell."

(11) School and Community Relationships--7 items

Items ask about various kinds of parent involvement and communication between teachers and parents.

Samples: "Most parents understand and promote the school's instructional program."

"Most teachers in this school communicate frequently with parents."

(12) Equity--9 items

Questions ask about segregation of groups and efforts to serve students effectively regardless of race, national origin, or gender.

Samples: "Racial and ethnic minority students are encouraged to remain in school."

"There is representation of various racial and ethnic groups and both sexes in textbooks, literary materials and films in the school."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is easy to use, inexpensive, and covers a wide range of characteristics of effective schools. Most scales appear face valid. The "School Effectiveness" constructs (numbers 5-11) are based directly on the effective schools literature and can be straightforwardly applied to school improvement programs directed at those factors.

No reliability or validity evidence is presented, one of the scales (Consideration) appears not to measure the intended construct, and some scales seem to overlap considerably in content (e.g., Clear School Mission, High Expectations, and Academic Press).

11. Comments:

A parent questionnaire modeled on this staff questionnaire has been developed. It is available from H. Clark, Capital Region Education Council, 599 Matianack Ave., Windsor, CT 06095; (203) 688-7333.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Connecticut Secondary School Development Project Student Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 8

2. Author(s):

   Principal Author: Alice Evans

3. Institution:

   Connecticut State Department of Education

4. Available from:

   Alice Evans, School Effectiveness Unit, Bureau of School and Program Development, Division of Educational Support Services, State Department of Education, Hartford, CT 06145

5. Intended Purpose:

   Surveys are used to assess the perceptions of secondary school students regarding school effectiveness and climate variables. The results are used to set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   The measures of school effectiveness are based largely on a content analysis of the effective schools literature. Content validity for seven of the twelve measures is described in the Handbook for Use of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire, Connecticut Department of Education, 1984.

8. Scoring:

   The results are machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   (1) Decision Making--8 items

   Questions ask about the existence of standard practices for solving school problems and involvement of staff, students, and administrators in school decision making.

   Sample: "The student government makes important decisions."

   Five of the items in this scale are identical or nearly identical to the staff survey scale of the same name.

(2) Consideration--10 items

Questions ask about student and teacher morale, teacher-student rapport, and feedback from staff to students.

Samples: "Students can count on teachers to listen to their side of the story and to be fair."

"Students are praised for good performance."

Seven of the ten items are identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

(3) Academic Press--8 items

Questions ask about the academic climate of the school: homework assignment and completion, student attendance and preparedness, student effort and enthusiasm for learning.

Sample: "Most students in this school are eager and enthusiastic about learning."

Seven of the eight items are identical or nearly identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

(4) School Responsiveness to Students' Needs--11 items

This scale contains items asking about opportunities for involvement in extracurricular activities and other special programs, diversity and relevance of educational experiences, availability of counseling assistance, fairness of graduation requirements, and principal visibility.

Samples: "The majority of students in this school participate in extracurricular activities."

"Graduation requirements are fair in this school."

"The principal is highly visible throughout the school."

This scale appears to measure more than one dimension of school climate.

(5) Safe and Orderly Environment--11 items

The items in this scale are concerned with school safety, discipline, the physical condition of the building, and the learning atmosphere.

Sample: "The school has adequate disciplinary procedures for dealing with disruptive behavior."

Eight of the eleven items are identical or nearly identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

(6) Clear School Mission--8 items

Questions ask about the existence of written names for behavior, instructional goal consensus, and the communication of the school's mission to students. Four items ask about the quality of the teaching staff and one about the availability of instructional materials.

Samples: "One of the great strengths of this school is its teaching staff."

"Teachers and students are able to get the instructional materials they need at the time they are needed."

"Teachers here agree on what is most important for students to learn."

This scale appears to measure teaching staff quality as well as school mission. Four of the eight items are identical or nearly identical to the Clear School Mission scale in the staff questionnaire of the same name.

(7) High Expectations--10 items

Questions ask about expectations for student achievement, teacher praise, standards for academic performance, and the school's response to low-achieving students.

Sample: "Students not mastering subject matter are required to repeat the course."

Six of the ten items in this scale are identical or nearly identical to the High Expectations scale in the staff questionnaire of the same name.

(8) Frequent Monitoring of Pupil's Progress--8 items

Questions ask about the frequency of feedback to students about academic work, monitoring seatwork, and classroom and building-level assessment practices.

Sample: "Students can talk easily with teachers about lessons and grades."

Four of the eight items are identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

(9) Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task--9 items

Questions ask about effective classroom management and teaching strategies expected to maximize instructional time, interruptions, and whether students are adequately prepared for the SAT.

Samples: "Teachers are well-prepared for class and start and end class promptly."

"Students are adequately prepared by this school to take standardized tests such as the SAT."

Four of the nine items are identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

(10) School and Community Relationships--7 items

Questions ask about various kinds of parent involvement and communication between parents and teachers, homework policies, and the parents' rating of the school.

Samples: "Students and parents are aware of the homework policy in this school."

"My parents initiate many contacts with the school."

Five of the seven items in this scale are identical or nearly identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

(11) Equity--10 items

Questions ask about segregation of groups, discrimination, and efforts to provide equivalent services to all students regardless of national origin, race, or gender.

Samples: "Students do not feel discriminated against in any way at this school."

"Courses stress the accomplishments of various racial and ethnic groups."

Six of the ten items in this scale are identical or nearly identical to items in the secondary staff survey scale of the same name.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is easy to use, inexpensive, and covers a wide range of characteristics of effective schools. Most scales appear face valid. The "school effectiveness" constructs (numbers 5-11) are based directly on the effective schools literature and can be straightforwardly applied to school improvement programs directed at those factors.

The assessment instrument is divided into two forms, each having 50 items and measuring half of the dimensions. Teachers are instructed to distribute the forms randomly in the classrooms. This clever arrangement effectively cuts administration time in half.

No reliability and validity information is yet available (although the author has plans to conduct such studies). Two of the measures appear to measure more than one dimension, and some overlap considerably in content.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Chicago Effective Schools Project: The Needs Assessment Instrument (1982), Project No. 10

2. Author(s):

Chicago Public Schools

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Sylvia Brandon, Director, Chicago Effective Schools Project, Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, 1819 W. Pershing Road, East Center 6, Chicago, IL 60609

5. Intended Purpose:

This elementary and middle school questionnaire assesses perceptions of teachers, older students, principals, school staff, and community about principal leadership, school climate, instructional emphasis, staff development, parent involvement and support, and use of assessment results to improve instruction. Results are intended for use in setting priorities for school improvement.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

(1) Leadership--11 items

Items cover principal management and supervision.

Samples: "The principal frequently observes classroom instruction and confers with teachers on methods of improvement."

"The principal seeks input from staff to resolve issues affecting the school."

"Meetings are held that involve staff in the solution of problems in and around the school."

(2) School Climate--17 items

This scale deals with the interaction between principal, staff and students, school pride, and discipline.

Samples: "The principal and staff believe that all students can learn."

"Students demonstrating severe disruptive [illegible]ior are the focus of specific plans for improvement in[illegible] [illegible]ident, members of the staff, and parents.

This scale lacks face validity.

(3) Instructional Emphasis--29 items

Items ask about clarity of curriculum goals and objectives, teachers' preparation of materials and monitoring of feedback, and staff expectations.

Samples: "A variety of teaching methods is used to meet the needs of individual learners."

"Teachers have lessons prepared and materials readily available so that little disruption occurs during changes from one content area to another.

"High expectations of student performance are held by the principal and staff."

This scale lacks face validity.

(4) Staff Development--11 items

Items focus on staff inservice trainig and staff development activities.

Samples: "Inservice time is used efficiently and effectively."

"Staff development is used as a change model for instructional improvement."

"Staff development activities have allowed me to grow as a teacher."

(5) Parent Involvement and Support--15 items

Questions ask about training programs for parents and parent involvement and support.

Samples: "Parent training programs are offered in the school that assist parents in working with their children."

"Meaningful in-school activities are provided for parents and community members."

"There is an emphasis on positive teacher-parent interaction including periodic notification of class and individual achievements/progress/success."

(6) Assessment Data--9 items

Items inquire about use of standardized tests, evaluation of student progress, and reinforcement of student achievement.

Samples: "Teachers use objective data to improve instruction."

"Each student is thoroughly evalutated (at least 8-10 times per year) and his/her progress is systematically monitored by appropriate teaching and administrative staff."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Items on the questionnaire appear easy to understand and cover many "effective schools" characteristics.

This instrument is not well constructed. Two of the six scales lack face validity. No manual is provided, no evidence of reliability or validity is presented, and instructions for administration, scoring, and summarizing results are sketchy.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Analysis: Teacher Interview (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

   Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

   To assess elementary and secondary school teacher perceptions about school characteristics such as inservice training and public image. Results were used to help set priorities for school improvement planning in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

   Forty-four questions cover a wider range of topics ranging from opinions about inservice training for substitutes to the public image of the school.

   Samples: "Do you, or the school, group students you teach?"

   "The best thing about your teaching is . . .?"

   We cannot assess the specific scale content or the face validity because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity is presented, and we cannot assess the face validity of most instruments in this group because we lack information about how items are grouped. The assessment is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs).

11. Comments:

This device was excluded from the analysis of scales.

School Effectiveness Program personnel planned to revise these instruments to permit machine scoring to save time and improve accuracy.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Analysis: Principal Interview (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

   Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

   Kentucky Department of Education

4. Available from:

   Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

   To assess elementary and secondary school principal perceptions about school characteristics such as inservice training and public image. Results were used to help set priorities for school improvement planning in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

   Twenty-seven questions cover a range of topics including student, teacher, and parent input into school decision making, use of time in classrooms, availability of teaching resources.

   Samples: "Has your school assessed its strengths and needs in instructional areas?"

   "How do you acknowledge teachers who do an outstanding job?"

   We cannot assess the specific scale content or the face validity because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity was presented, and we could not assess the face validity of most instruments in this group because we lacked information about how items were grouped. The assessment is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs).

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales

School Effectiveness Program personnel planned to revise these instruments to permit machine scoring to save time and improve accuracy.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Analysis: Student Officer Interview (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

   Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

   Same as above

4. Available from:

   Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

   To assess student feelings and perceptions of school reward practices and school climate. Results were used to help set priorities in planning for school improvement in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

   Twenty questions (10 open-ended oral and 10 open-ended written) ask about a range of topics including feelings of self-worth, selection of friends, school practices of rewarding students, and academic climate.

   Samples: "Which are your favorite subjects?"

   "What are your future plans?"

   We cannot assess the specific scale content or the face validity because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity was presented, and we could not assess the face validity of most instruments in this group because we lacked information about how items were grouped. The assessment is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs).

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from our analysis of scales.

School Effectiveness Program personnel planned to revise these instruments to permit machine scoring to save time and improve accuracy.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Effectiveness Analysis: Elementary Student Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

To assess elementary students' liking of school and perceptions of rewards, instructional practices, feedback about school work, and self-concept. Results were used to set priorities in planning for school improvement in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

Seventeen items are student reports of teacher practices in the following areas: use of time, clarity of instructional objectives, feedback, rewards and recognition, communication with parents, grouping, seatwork, variety of learning activities, questioning strategies, and homework. Two items ask how students feel about school work.

Samples: "Does the work you do in school make you feel good about yourself?"

"Does your teacher encourage you to think for yourself?"

We could not assess the specific scale content or the face validity because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity was presented, and we could not assess the face validity of most instruments in this group because we lacked information about how items were grouped. The assessment as a whole is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs)--although this questionnaire is short and appears to use machine-scored answer sheets and thus would not be expensive and time-consuming.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from our analysis of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Analysis: Secondary Student Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

   Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

   To assess secondary student opinion about school effectiveness and climate variables for the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program. Results were used to help set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   Twenty-four questions ask about clarity of teacher expectations, student-teacher interaction, teacher questioning strategies, feedback, use of classroom time, independent work, student respect for teachers, teacher respect for students, student recognition programs, clarity and fairness of school rules, liking for school, course offerings, social integration, and fairness of the grading system.

   Sample: "Overall, would you rate this a good school?"

   We cannot assess the specific scale content or the face validity because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity was presented, and we could not assess the face validity of most instruments in this group because we lacked information about how items were grouped. The assessment as a whole is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs)--although this questionnaire is short and appears to use machine-scored answer sheets and thus would not be expensive and time consuming.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from our analysis of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

School Effectiveness Program personnel planned to revise these instruments to permit machine scoring to save time and improve accuracy.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Analysis: Parent Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

   Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky
   Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

   To assess the perceptions of parents of elementary and secondary students about parent awareness and involvement, homework, school discipline, and communication in their children's school. Results were used to help set priorities for school improvement planning in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   Twenty-five questions ask about parent involvement in school decision making, parent awareness of their children's school progress, activities, and learning objectives, the variety of learning activities, opinions about the amount of homework given, visits to the school, awareness of the school's testing program, discipline, and attendance policies, accessibility of staff, school use of rewards for students, and parents' source of information about the school.

   Sample: "Do you feel welcome in your child's school?"

   We could not assess the specific scale content or the face validity because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity was presented, and we could not assess the face validity of most instruments in this group because we lacked information about how items were grouped. The assessment as a whole is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school). plus materials and scoring costs)--although this assessment device could be machine-scored.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Effectiveness Analysis: Teacher/Administrator Assessment Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

To assess elementary and secondary teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness, climate, and process variables. Results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Appropriate, Consistent Curriculum--9 items

Items ask about the alignment of the curriculum with the testing program and the learning objectives; teacher, student, and parent input into the curriculum development process.

Samples: There is a match between instruction and the written curriculum."

"The curriculum reflects the values and goals of the community."

(2) Community Support and Involvement--10 items

Questions ask about community involvement in school activities, community input into school decision making, student participation in community activities, accessibility of school staff to community members, use of community volunteers and speakers, and teacher-parent communication.

Samples: "Community participation at school events is noticeable."

"Parents work with students at home to support school programs."

This scale lacks face validity.

(3) Effective Teaching--12 items

Questions ask about teacher expectations, use of time, matching teaching styles to learning styles, behavior management, teacher knowledge of subject matter, classroom atmosphere, and professional growth experiences.

Samples: "Teachers demonstrate a variety of teaching methods and skills to match teaching styles with learning styles."

"Expectations for student learning are clear to teachers, students, administrators, and the public."

(4) Good Communications--11 items

Questions ask about principal classroom observations, feedback to students, clarity of discipline policies, student, staff, and parent input into the development of discipline policies, teacher-parent and teacher-administrator communication, press coverage of the school, and teacher collegiality.

Samples: "Often the 'grapevine' is more accurate and efficient than the regular lines of communication."

"Discipline policies, rules and codes are administered fairly."

This scale lacks face validity.

(5) Expectations for Learning--10 items

Items ask about the school's and teachers' expectations for student achievement, administrators' expectations for teacher performance, teachers' use of class time, feedback, rewards, praise and recognition, and characteristics of students who are retained.

Samples: "Teachers create an environment that models high learning expectations by using class time effectively."

"Students retained in a grade are not from any one income level."

(6) Quality Time-on-Task--10 items

Items ask about teachers' use of time in the classroom, the level of student engaged time, degree of noninstructional classroom time, interruptions, and students' level of success.

Samples: "Special events are planned to fit into and enhance the total instructional program."

"Students are engaged every day in learning activities which bring success to them."

(7) Orderly, Safe Learning Climate--10 items

Questions ask about perceptions of safety, condition of the school building, staff morale, student pride, respect, clarity of rules and consistency of enforcement, treatment of students, and teacher-administration cooperation.

Samples: "Administrators and teachers collaborate to ensure a well-run school day; there is little administrator/teacher tension."

"The building and grounds are in good repair and show evidence of upkeep."

This scale lacks face validity.

(8) Student Progress Assessed and Monitored--10 items

Questions ask about feedback to students, characteristics of the testing program, uses of student assessment information, alignment of the tests with instructional objectives and what is taught, commitment to assessment and accountability, and the evaluation plan for the district.

Samples: "Education goals and learner outcomes are coordinated through an evaluation plan for the district."

"Teachers provide prompt feedback to students regarding their daily accomplishments."

This scale lacks face validity.

(9) Sense of Mission, Commitment--8 items

Questions ask about curriculum objectives, school goals and missions, assessment, and teacher, student, and parent involvement in development of school goals.

Samples: "Relevant knowledge, skills, and attitudes are sequenced and specified."

"The primary mission of the school is understood by all school personnel as well as community members."

This scale lacks face validity.

(10) Instructional Leadership--10 items

Questions ask about principal practices regarding staff development, classroom observation, coordination of the instructional program, and use of evaluation information. Items also assess more general perceptions of the principal's ability to stimulate the staff, his or her responsiveness and accessibility, and administrative style.

Samples: "School administrators project a positive view of the school and its programs, staff, and the student body."

"The principal is accessible and responsive to teachers."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The assessment appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity was presented, and the assessment as a whole is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs)--although this questionnaire can be machine-scored.

The teacher questionnaire items are grouped, but half of the groupings lack even face validity. Items were borrowed from the Colorado State Department of Education's "Indicators of Quality Schools" instrument without attribution. The Colorado items are scattered across different item groupings in the Kentucky instrument.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Effectiveness Analysis: Class Engaged Time Analysis (1984), Project No. 12

2. Author(s):

Kentucky Department of Education

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Division of School Improvement, Office of Instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601.

5. Intended Purpose:

This classroom observation instrument was used in the Kentucky School Effectiveness Program to estimate time spent on different instructional activities and the engagement rate of students. Results were used in setting priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

This is an observation instrument to estimate time spent on different instructional activities and the engagement rate of students. Observers record the activity and the number of students engaged in each of fourteen time segments (approximately four minutes each segment).

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

We cannot assess the validity of the engaged time analysis instrument. The instructions for calculating engaged rate would result in a distribution of engaged rates that does not reflect the actual observation. For example, a classroom with 50-60% of its students judged to be engaged at every time period would receive a summary engaged time of 20%.

The assessment, as a whole, appears comprehensive in that it assesses staff, students, and parents from most levels within the school system. But no evidence of reliability or validity is presented, and the assessment as a whole is very expensive (4-6 people for 2-4 weeks per school, plus materials and scoring costs).

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from analyses in the main body of the report because it is an observation instrument.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

The Effective School Battery: Teacher Survey (1984), Project No. 13

2. Author(s):

Gary D. Gottfredson

3. Institution:

Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University

4. Available from:

Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. (PAR), P. O. Box 98,
Odessa, FL 33556, (800) 331-TEST

5. Intended Purpose:

This instrument is used to assess teachers' perceptions about school effectiveness, climate, and process variables. Assessment results provide a basis for setting priorities for school improvement for individual schools or for a district, for evaluating programs, opening up communication, or providing ongoing indicators related to organizational health and research on schools.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha reliabilities for individual-level teacher scales range from .54 to .80 (average = .70). Alpha reliabilities for teacher climate scales range from .65 to .94 (average = .84). One-year retest reliabilities for school-level averages of individual teacher scales range from .31 to .66 (average = .46). One-year retest reliabilities for school-climate measures for teachers range from .45 to .75 (average = .60). Two-year retest reliabilities are also provided.

7. Validity Information:

Correlations between ESB scales and other measures and information from research studies and experimental evaluations that used the ESB scales are presented. The evidence implies that the ESB scales are valid measures and that there is little variation in validity for different subgroups.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by PAR's scoring service.

9. Content:

(1) Avoidance of Grades as a Sanction--2 items (alpha = .65)

Samples: "When a student misbehaves in my class, I sometimes lower his or her grade."

"In your dealings with misbehaving students how often do you lower their grades if misconduct is reported?"

(2) Student Influence--5 items (alpha = .85)

Questions ask about student input into setting school and classroom rules, running the school, and determining lesson plans.

Samples: "Students help to make the school rules."

"I often change my lesson plans based on student suggestions."

(3) Parent and Community Involvement--6 items (alpha = .81)

Items ask about parental influence on school policies, practices, goals, and programs, how often parents serve as tutors or aides, and how receptive the community is to new ideas.

Samples: "Parents and the community are receptive to new ideas."

"Parents help to decide about new school programs."

(4) Race Relations--2 items (alpha = .74)

Samples: "In your opinion, how well do the following groups get along at your school? . . . Students of different races? Students of different nationalities?"

(5) Resources for Instruction--4 items (alpha = .81)

This scale asks about the level of resources (teaching supplies, space, out-of-school settings used for instruction, and timely availability of resources) available in the school.

Sample: "This school supplies me with the material and equipment I need for teaching."

(6) Smooth Administration--12 items (alpha = .93)

Questions ask about the administrative style, specific principal practices, and about the general management of the school.

Samples: "It is hard to change the established procedures here."

"The administration is supportive of teachers."

"The principal is aware of and lets staff members and students know when they have done something particularly well."

(7) Planning and Action--9 items (alpha = .89)

Questions ask about teacher involvement in school planning, whether or not the principal encourages experimentation in teaching, whether or not evaluation is used in improving teacher performance, and asks about the extent to which the staff and principal are innovative.

Samples: "How often do you work on a planning committee with other teachers or administrators from your school?"

"Teacher evaluation is used in improving teacher performance."

(8) Morale--11 items (alpha = .94)

Questions ask about the extent to which the school faculty is apathetic, cohesive, enthusiastic, frustrated, satisfied, tense, and unappreciated, and about student and teacher morale.

Samples: "Students here don't really care about the school."

"I feel my ideas are listened to and used in this school."

(9) Safety--10 items (alpha = .94)

Questions ask about the safety of various areas in the school, teacher fear for safety, and the level of school disorder.

Samples: "In your opinion, how much of a problem are vandalism, personal attacks, and theft in your school."

"Since you started school this year, how many times did you hesitate to confront misbehaving students for fear of your own safety."

(10) Nonauthoritarian Attitudes--3 items (alpha = .54)

Samples: "If a pupil uses obscene or profane language in school, it should be considered a moral offense."

"A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly."

"The threat or use of physical punishment is an effective way of dealing with misbehaving students."

(11) Professional Development--8 items (alpha = .54)

Items ask about the degree of inservice training the teacher had this year.

Samples: "How often do you attend professional development courses that are half a day or more in length?"

". . . This year, have you learned much about how to handle disruptive students?"

(12) Classroom Orderliness--2 items (alpha = .78)

Samples: "How much of your time in the classroom is directed to coping with disruptive student behavior?"

"How much does the behavior of some students in your classroom (talking, fighting, etc.) keep you from teaching?"

(13) Personal Security--8 items (alpha = .67)

Questions ask whether or not the teacher was the victim of several different crimes and incivilities during the past month.

Samples: "In the past month have any of the following happened to you personally in this school? . . . Had a weapon pulled on me . . . Received obscene remarks or gestures from a student."

(14) Interaction with Students--6 items (alpha = .67)

Samples: "How often do you engage in the following activities with students? . . . Tutoring individual students before or after school. . . . Discussing students' personal problems with them."

(15) Job Satisfaction--3 items (alpha = .80)

Questions ask about liking for and satisfaction with the job.

Samples: "How do you like your job?"

"How much of the time do you feel satisfied with your job?"

(16) Prointegration Attitudes--4 items (alpha = .69)

Items ask opinions about the value of school integration.

"Most black students are better off in all-black schools."

"Students should not be bused to achieve racial balance."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The scales are reliable and valid and reflect the results of a broad research base. A separate pamphlet assists users in interpreting the ESB scales in terms of the "Effective Schools Characteristics." Clear instructions for administration and interpretation are provided. Normative information allows comparisons across schools. A scoring service is provided at a reasonable cost.

The test booklets are more expensive than many devices ($1/booklet). The names of the scales do not coincide with the "effective schools characteristics" that many schools are targeting.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

The Effective School Battery: Student Survey (1984), Project No. 13

2. Author(s):

Gary D. Gottfredson

3. Institution:

Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University

4. Available from:

Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. (PAR), P. O. Box 98,
Odessa, FL 33556, (800) 331-TEST

5. Intended Purpose:

This instrument is used to assess the perceptions of students in grades 7 to 12 about school climate and process variables. Assessment results provide a basis for setting priorities for school improvement for individual schools or for a district, for evaluating programs, opening up communication, or providing ongoing indicators related to organizational health and research on schools.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha reliabilities for individual-level student scales range from .43 to .78 (average = .58). Alpha reliabilities for student climate scales range from .67 to .94 (average = .80). One-year retest reliabilities for individual-level student scales (for males) range from .27 to .70 (average = .41). One-year retest reliabilities for school-level averages of individual student scales range from .50 to .95 (average = .78). One-year retest reliabilities for school-climate measures for students range from .62 to .84 (average = .76) Two-year retest reliabilities are also provided. Reliabilities for race and gender subgroups are provided for individual-level student measures and indicate little variation in reliability for subgroups.

7. Validity Information:

Correlations between ESB scales and other measures and information from research studies and experimental evaluations that used the ESB scales are presented. The evidence implies that the ESB scales are valid measures and that there is little variation in validity for different subgroups.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by PAR's scoring service.

9. Content:

(1) Invalidity--5 items (alpha = .44)

Questions are asked to which a certain response would indicate that the respondent is lying or not answering the survey in a serious manner.

Sample: "I read several whole books every day."

(2) School Rewards--4 items (alpha = .56)

Questions ask about positive sanctions received in school.

"Did you get to do something special as a reward?"

(3) Avoidance of Punishment--4 items (alpha = .54)

Items ask about negative sanctions received in school.

Samples: "Were you sent out of class for punishment?"

"Was your grade lowered on an assignment as a punishment?"

(4) School Effort--5 items (alpha = .59)

Questions ask about effort expended on school work and desirable student behaviors.

Samples: "Compared to other students, how hard do you work in school?"

"If a teacher gives a lot of homework, I try to finish all of it."

(5) Positive Self-concept--12 items (alpha = .61)

Items ask about students' perceptions of themselves, especially with respect to dimensions of the self-concept most related to delinquent behavior and schooling outcomes.

"How do most other students in your school see you? . . . A good student? A trouble maker?"

(6) Involvement--12 items (alpha = .62)

Items ask students to report whether or not they were involved in 12 different activities (e.g., debating or drama, varsity or junior varsity athletic teams, helping out in the library or office).

(7) Interpersonal Competency--5 items (alpha = .43)

Items ask about the students' ability to deal with other people competently and about the clarity of the students' identity.

Samples: "I have a clear picture of what I am like as a person."

"I find it easy to talk with all kinds of people."

(8) Belief in Conventional Rules--6 items (alpha = .53)

Questions ask about students' belief in the validity of laws and social norms.

Samples: "It is all right to get around the law if you can."

"It is OK to take advantage of a chump or a sucker."

(9) Attachment to School--10 items (alpha = .76)

Items ask about positive feelings towards the school, the importance of school, and the school's ability to make the student "like to learn."

Samples: "How do you feel about the following? This school . . . . The classes you are taking."

(10) Social Integration--6 items (alpha = .51)

Questions ask about how well integrated the student feels, especially with respect to this school.

Samples: "I often feel awkward and out of place."

(11) Positive Peer Association--9 items (alpha = .65)

Questions ask about positive and negative peer influence.

Samples: Most of my friends think getting good grades is important."

"How many of your friends have been picked up by the police?"

(12) Parental Education--2 items (alpha = .78)

The items ask the student how far his or her mother and father went in school.

(13) Educational Expectation--1 item

This one-item measure asks, "As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get?"

(14) Student Influence--5 items (alpha = .74)

Questions ask about student input into making and changing school rules, determining lesson plans, and making important decisions about the school.

Sample: "Students have helped to make the school rules."

(15) Clarity of Rules--4 items (alpha = .67)

Questions ask about the clarity of expectations for student behavior and the firmness of the principal.

Samples: "Everyone knows what the school rules are."

"The principal runs the school with a firm hand."

(16) Fairness of Rules--3 items (alpha = .76)

Samples: "The school rules are fair."

"The punishment for breaking school rules is the same no matter who you are."

"The principal is fair."

(17) Planning and Action--3 items (alpha = .84)

Questions ask about planfulness and innovation in the school.

Samples: "This school hardly ever tries anything new."

"The teachers and principal in this school make plans to solve problems."

(18) Respect for Students--3 items (alpha = .85)

Samples: "Students are treated like children here."

"Teachers treat students with respect."

"Teachers do things that make students feel 'put down.'"

(19) Safety--13 items (alpha = .94)

Questions ask how often students stay away from various places for fear of their own safety, whether they have had to fight to protect themselves, and whether they have witnessed threats and attacks.

Sample: "In this term in school, have you: Seen a teacher threatened by a student?"

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The scales are reliable and valid and reflect the results of a broad research base. A separate pamphlet assists users in interpreting the ESB scales in terms of the "Effective Schools Characteristics." Clear instructions for administration and interpretation are provided. Normative information allows comparisons across schools. A scoring service is provided at a reasonable cost.

The test booklets are more expensive than many devices ($1/booklet). The names of the scales do not coincide with the "effective schools characteristics" that many schools are targeting.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Effectiveness Questionnaire--Elementary and Middle School Edition (1985), Project No. 15

2. Author(s):

   Detroit Public Schools Office of Instructional Improvement

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   School Improvement Program, Detroit Public Schools, Rm. 44 Schools Center, 5057 Woodward Ave., Detroit, MI 48202

5. Intended Purpose:

   This questionnaire was used in elementary and middle schools to assess teacher perceptions about school effectiveness and climate factors. Results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning in the Detroit School Improvement Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine scored by school system.

9. Content:

   (1) Safe and Orderly Environment--8 items

   Questions ask about the appearance of the building, whether discipline and security are issues in the school, general feelings about the school, student eagerness to learn, and whether students abide by the rules.

   Samples: "A positive feeling permeates the school."

   "Most students in this school are eager and enthusiatic about learning."

   This scale lacks face validity.

(2) Clear School Mission--7 items

Most items ask about the existence of a coordinated set of learning objectives and the extent to which instruction targets those objectives. Two additional items also ask the existence of a written school mission and remediation practices.

Samples: "In basic skills instruction in this school, reteaching and specific skills remediation are important parts of the teaching process."

"Language arts objectives are coordinated and monitored through all grades."

(3) Instructional Leadership--18 items

Items ask about problem-solving capability of the school, principal practices relating to the role of instructional leader, staff development, principal's communication with others, visibility, accessibility and use of standardized test results.

Samples: "The principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction."

"Most problems facing this school can be solved by the principal and faculty without a great deal of outside help."

(4) High Expectations--7 items

Four questions ask about teachers' beliefs about the potential of "all" students. Other questions ask about remediation practices and about perceptions of low-achievers' behaviors.

Samples: "Students not mastering basic skills frequently receive remediation."

"In this school, low-achieving students do not present more discipline problems than other students."

"Almost all students are expected to master basic skills at each grade level."

(5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task--9 items

Questions ask about the allocation of instructional time, the frequency of interruptions, the use of pull-out programs, and teaching practices that research has shown are related to learning: Time spent in independent seatwork, success rate during practice, and structure of lessons.

Sample: "Two hours or more are allocated for reading/language arts each day throughout this school."

(6) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress--7 items

Questions ask about the characteristics of the assessment process used in the school and whether the tests match the curriculum, about the use of the testing information as feedback to students, and about the frequency of feedback to students.

Samples: "There is systematic, regular assessment of students' basic skills in most classrooms."

"Teachers give students specific feedback on daily assignments."

(7) Home-School Relations--8 items

Questions ask about the clarity of the school's homework policy, the level of parent involvement in school activities, parent's general opinion of the school, the level of communication and cooperation between parents and teachers, and whether or not students usually do their homework.

Samples: "Almost all students complete assigned homework before coming to school."

"Beyond parent conferences and report cards, teachers in this school use several other ways for communicating student progress to parents."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This instrument is basically a shortened version of the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (see project 8). The Instructional Leadership, Opportunity to Learn, Student Time on Task, and Frequent Monitoring scales appear to measure well these characteristics identified in the effective schools literature. The materials look professional and the surveys are easy to complete.

The surveys could be improved with item analyses, and the quality of the scales appears uneven. The Safe and Orderly Environment scale does not appear as valid as the other scales. No reliability or validity evidence is provided.

11. Comments:

The Detroit School Improvement Program used two additional questionnaires that are not summarized here. The high school edition of the School Effectiveness Questionnaire includes a subset of items from the elementary and middle school Detroit survey. Items thought to be inappropriate for high schools were deleted, and a few questions were added. Examples of deletions are: Questions about the allocation of time were deleted from the Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-on-Task scales, questions specific to basic skills instruction were deleted from the Frequent Monitoring section, and many specific principal practices were deleted from the Instructional Leadership scale. All resulting scales, with the exception of Clear School Mission appear to be no less valid than the scales in the elementary/middle revision. Clear School Mission is a mixture of items about remediation, tracking, and mission.

The program also uses McREL's "Describing Your School's Characteristics" (see project 7). The Detroit version deletes one of McREL's items and is scored and presented differently. Detroit scores the "don't know" category as an average response, McREL as a negative response.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

The School Improvement Survey (1983), Project No. 16

2. Author(s):

Ronald V. Urick

3. Institution:

Wayne State University

4. Available from:

Ronald V. Urick, Administrative and Organizational Studies, Wayne State University (or Betty Stevens, Office of Technical Assistance and Evaluation, Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing, MI 48909)

5. Intended Purpose:

The instrument was used in the Michigan School Improvement Program to assess elementary teachers' perceptions about school effectiveness and process variables. Assessment results provided a basis for setting priorities for school improvement.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

(1) Teamwork and Communication--5 items

Items ask about communication among teachers and between the principal and teachers, about the extent of cooperation and conflict in the school.

Sample: "Staff members plan together and coordinate their efforts . . ."

(2) Administrator-Teacher Relations--6 items

Items ask about extent to which the principal understands teachers' problems and helps to solve them, accessibility of the principal, level of trust, and degree of conflict.

Sample: "Conflicts between teachers and principal are . . ."

(3) School Effectiveness--8 items

Items ask about emphasis on basic skills, academic expectations for students, the general climate, and the extent to which school staff help one another stay focused on the school's goals.

Samples: "The day-to-day climate in our building is
. . . rigid . . . flexible."

"The teachers help each other stay focused on accomplishing the school's goals for students."

(4) Instructional Effectiveness--9 items

Items ask about teacher use of instructional time and their practices regarding feedback to students, questioning, monitoring student progress, and classroom management, also teacher and principal expectations, tutoring, parent involvement.

Samples: "Parents are actively involved in the education of their children . . . (Gives examples)."

"Tutoring on a one-to-one basis is used in my school . . . (gives examples)."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The survey is short and inexpensive and would identify global needs in general areas. The scales appear to measure the global dimensions intended, but the dimensions may be too global to provide specific guidance for school improvement. The coverage of each component of instructional and school effectiveness is narrow--approximately one item per component. While the items probably identify major problems in each given area, they measure only a small portion of each domain.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   The S.H.A.L. Assessment Instrument (1981), Project No. 18

2. Author(s):

   St. Louis Public Schools

3. Institution:

   St. Louis Public Schools

4. Available from:

   Efficient and Effective Schools Program, St. Louis Public Schools, 5234 Wells, St. Louis, MO 63113.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This teacher questionnaire for elementary schools was used to assess school climate and process variables first in Project SHAL and then in the Effective and Efficient Schools Program (an expansion of the SHAL process) in St. Louis schools. Assessment results are used to set priorities for schools and to open discussion and start planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   (1) Administrative Leadership--60 items

   Questions ask about leadership, initiative, collaboration, communication, interpersonal competency, decision making, and some general climate items.

   Sample: "The principal encourages teachers to show initiative."

   (2) School Climate--56 items

   This scale contains items intended to assess general climate (morale, respect, caring, etc.), specific school practices (rules cooperatively determined, reward system etc), school processes (e.g. problem-solving, decision making processes), and resources(e.g. staffing, budget, physical plant). It is an abbreviated version of the CFK school climate assessment instrument (Fox, 1976).

Other: The other scales in this instrument are Instructional Focus, Ongoing Assessment, Teacher Expectations, Resources, Instruction, and Attitude. We were unable to assess the scale content and face validity of these scales because we had no information on how they were scored.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The two scales we were able to assess appear to be face valid. The administrator leadership questions appear to be a competent translation of the "effective schools literature" in this area.

However, no reliability or validity evidence was provided. An arbitrary cut-point is used for interpreting scores, and no justification for using this cutpoint is provided. A whole section of the questionnaire is taken without attribution from the CFK instrument.

11. Comment:

The six scales whose item content we were unable to determine were excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Principal Interview Form (2nd Edition, 1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This interview instrument assesses principal perceptions about school climate and processes. Results were used to set priorities for planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Forty-two open-ended questions ask about principal administrative style, instructional emphasis on basic skills, school climate, ongoing assessment, and teacher expectations.

Samples: "Do you feel that teachers find you accessible and responsive to their needs?"

"Does this school have any formalized educational goals and objectives? How were they established? By whom?"

"Are teachers expected to achieve their goals?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Items are clearly worded and seem to reflect the scope of principal responsibility, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. Open-ended interviews are time-consuming to conduct and score. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

See Guzzetti (1983) for an earlier assessment of this instrument. This earlier review pointed to the cumbersome nature of the data analysis necessitated by the open-ended format, the absence of easily-interpretable feedback, and the absence of validity information as weaknesses. It pointed to the content of the questions and the triangulation provided by asking similar questions of multiple respondents as strengths. Like Guzzetti, we had difficulty obtaining a complete set of materials for our review.

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Assistant Principal Interview Form (2nd Edition, 1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

   Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This interview instrument assesses assistant principal perceptions about school climate and processes. Results were used to set priorities for planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Forty-two open-ended questions ask about principal administrative style, instructional emphasis on basic skills, school climate, ongoing assessment, and teacher expectations.

   Samples: "Do you feel that teachers find you accessible and responsive to their needs?"

   "Does this school have any formalized educational goals and objectives? How were they established? By whom?"

   "Are teachers expected to achieve their goals?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. **Strengths and Weaknesses:**

Items are clearly worded and seem to reflect the scope of vice-principal responsibility, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. Open-ended interviews are time consuming to conduct and score.

11. **Comments:**

See Guzzetti (1983) for an earlier assessment of this instrument. This earlier review pointed to the cumbersome nature of the data analysis necessitated by the open-ended format, the absence of easily-interpretable feedback, and the absence of validity information as weaknesses. It listed the content of the questions and the triangulation provided by asking similar questions of multiple respondents as strengths. Like Guzzetti, we had difficulty obtaining a complete set of materials for our review.

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Classroom Instructional Staff Interview Form A (2nd Edition, 1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This interview instrument assesses instructional staff perceptions about school climate and processes and teaching methods. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Forty-nine open-ended questions ask about methods of teaching reading, time allocation, ongoing assessment of student progress, cooperation with other teachers, and suggestions for improvement.

Samples: "What is the main approach you use to teach reading (basal {specify}, phonics, individualized reading, language experience, etc.)?"

"In your opinion, what are the major strengths, the greatest assets of this school? What are its most commendable practices or characteristics?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Items are clearly worded and seem relevant, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. Open-ended interviews are time consuming to conduct and score. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

See Guzzetti (1983) for an earlier assessment of this instrument. This earlier review pointed to the cumbersome nature of the data analysis necessitated by the open-ended format, the absence of easily-interpretable feedback, and the absence of validity information as weaknesses. It listed the content of the questions and the triangulation provided by asking similar questions of multiple respondents as strengths. Like Guzzetti, we had difficulty obtaining a complete set of materials for our review.

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Classroom Instructional Staff Interview Form B (2nd Edition, 1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This interview assesses instructional staff perceptions about elementary school climate and processes and teaching methods. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Forty-eight open-ended questions ask about methods of teaching reading, time allocation, ongoing assessment of student progress, cooperation with other teachers, and suggestions for improvement (as in Form A) but questions also inquire about staff development, school discipline, and lesson plans.

Samples: "Is there any in-service training or staff development provided in the school? Yes__No__ If yes, describe."

"Are written lesson plans required in this school? Y_N_ If yes: What type of lesson plans do you use?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Items are clearly worded and seem relevant, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. Open-ended interviews are time consuming to conduct and score. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

See Guzzetti (1983) for an earlier assessment of this instrument. This earlier review pointed to the cumbersome nature of the data analysis necessitated by the open-ended format, the absence of easily-interpretable feedback, and the absence of validity information as weaknesses. It listed the content of the questions and the triangulation provided by asking similar questions of multiple respondents as strengths. Like Guzzetti, we had difficulty obtaining a complete set of materials for our review.

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Classroom Teacher Questionnaire (1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire assesses classroom teacher perceptions about elementary school climate, instructional leadership, parent involvement, school processes, and teaching methods. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Seventy-seven multiple choice and open-ended items inquire about teaching methods, monitoring of student progress, instructional leadership, parent-teacher-principal relations, staff and student attitudes, staff development, and major school problems and suggested solutions.

Samples: "What is the main approach that you use to teach reading?"

"How would you describe the quality of parental involvement in this school?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Items are clearly worded and seem relevant, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided. Most items are multiple choice and fairly easy to complete. The instrument is inexpensive to administer and score.

11. Comments:

See Guzzetti (1983) for an earlier assessment of this instrument. This earlier review pointed to the cumbersome nature of the data analysis necessitated by the open-ended format, the absence of easily-interpretable feedback, and the absence of validity information as weaknesses. It listed the content of the questions and the triangulation provided by asking similar questions of multiple respondents as strengths. Like Guzzetti, we had difficulty obtaining a complete set of materials for our review.

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Special Program Instructional Staff Interview (2nd Edition, 1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

   Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This interview instrument assesses special program teacher perceptions about elementary school climate, coordination of instruction between regular and special classes, parent involvement, school processes, and teaching methods. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Thirty-two multiple choice and open-ended items inquire about teaching methods, resources, use of standardized tests, instructional leadership for special programs, parent involvement in special programs, discipline, security, and maintenance, staff development, and major school problems and suggested solutions.

   Samples: "Please describe the instructional approach and methodologies you use most often in your program?"

   "Is the administration accessible to special program staff?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This instrument is interesting in that it assesses special program instructional staff experience in particular, but no evidence of reliability or validity was provided. Open-ended interviews are time consuming to conduct and score. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Special Program Teacher Questionnaire (1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

   Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Application for permission to reprint any part of the questionnaire should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201

5. Intended Purpose:

   This questionnaire assesses special program teacher perceptions about elementary school climate, coordination of instruction between regular and special classes, parent involvement, school processes, and teaching methods. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Forty multiple choice and open-ended items inquire about teaching methods, resources, use of standardized tests, instructional leadership for special programs, parent involvement in special programs, discipline, security, and maintenance, staff development, and major school problems and suggested solutions.

   Samples: "In your opinion, what are the most pressing problems, issues facing this school?"

   "Have you read the original proposal for this program?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Items are clearly worded and seem relevant, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. Most items are multiple choice and fairly easy to complete. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Para Interview Form (1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This interview assesses paraprofessional staff perceptions about elementary school climate, parent involvement, school processes, and their jobs. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Sixteen questions ask about the job description of a para, parent interest, school encouragement of parent participation, communication of test results to parents, safety, discipline, and strengths and weaknesses of the school.

Samples: "Is the school a safe place? Is it well-maintained? How is discipline in the school?"

"Does the school inform parents regularly of their children's academic progress? How are parents informed?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This interview has questions especially appropriate for assessing paras' perceptions, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. Open-ended interviews are time-consuming to administer and score. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Auxiliary Staff Interview Form (1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

Assesses perceptions of auxiliary staff about elementary school climate, parent involvement, school processes, and their jobs. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Twelve questions ask about the person's assignment, length of service, residence, parent interest and school encouragement of parent participation, faculty and staff expectations and dedication, school safety and discipline, and strengths and weaknesses of the school.

Sample: "Do parents seem to be interested in the education of their children?"

"Does the school attempt to encourage parental participation?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This interview has questions especially appropriate for assessing auxiliary staff perceptions, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Parent Interview Form (1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the interview should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This interview instrument assesses perceptions of parents about parent-school communication, their school involvement, staff dedication, and positive and negative aspects of the school. Results were used to set priorities for school-level planning in the School Improvement Project in New York City.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Nineteen questions ask about membership in the Parent Association, involvement in the school, communication, encouragement of parent participation, staff expectations and dedication, school safety and discipline, and strengths and weaknesses of the school.

Samples: "How often do you visit the school? For what purpose?"

"Do you feel that teachers expect students to do well in school?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This interview has questions especially appropriate for assessing parent perceptions, but no evidence of reliability or validity was presented. No specific instructions for administration and scoring were provided.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Project (SIP) Needs Assessment Instrument: Building and Grounds Observational Assessment (1980), Project No. 19

2. Author(s):

Board of Education of the City of New York

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Application for permission to reprint any part of the observation form should be made to: Chancellor, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201.

5. Intended Purpose:

This observation instrument was used to assess the condition of elementary school buildings in the School Improvement Project in New York City. Results from this instrument were combined with other questionnaire and interview data to help set priorities in planning for school improvement.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

This three-sectioned device inquires about the physical condition of the entire school. A list of areas are rated for adequacy for normally intended purposes, maintenance, cleanliness, and attractiveness. It asks for explanations of "fair" or "unsatisfactory" ratings. A third section asks for an evaluation of space being used for a different purpose than originally intended.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This is an interesting device for assessing the physical condition of the building.

11. Comment:

This device was excluded from analyses of scales because it is an observation instrument.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Middle Grades Assessment Program (1984), Project No. 21

2. Author(s):

Gayle Dorman

3. Institution:

Center for Early Adolescence, University of North Carolina.

4. Available from:

The Center for Early Adolescence, The University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill, Suite 223, Carr Mill Mall, Carrboro, NC 27510

5. Intended Purpose:

The interview and observation instruments are embedded within a larger framework of staff development and school improvement. The instruments measure the perceptions of students, teachers, principals, parents, and other staff about school effectiveness, climate, and process variables in their middle grade schools. Assessment results are used to engage the school staff in activities to encourage discussion about strengths and weaknesses, to set priorities for school improvement efforts, to build consensus, to plan inservice training, etc.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

(1) Safety--6 items

Questions ask the principal, teachers, students, and support staff if students and staff fear for their physical or emotional safety. Emotional safety means that people can express ideas, concerns, and questions without being ridiculed. The scale also includes observation of the general environment about whether or not staff belittle individuals or groups of individuals in front of others. It also includes the principal's report of money spent on vandalism repairs.

(2) Academic Effectiveness--20 items

Questions ask about the existence of a school philosophy, the principal as the instructional leader, openness to change and experimentation, positive expectations for children, participation, decision making, principal use of praise, and whether early adolescence issues are the topic of staff development.

Samples: "The principal rewards good teaching with praise and recognition."

"There is a generally accepted school philosophy."

(3) Diversity--25 items

This scale includes items about the extent to which the school schedule, curriculum, materials, physical plant, and methods meet the need for diversity.

Samples: "Students have some opportunities for interaction with students in other grades at the school."

"The schedule is flexible, including some block scheduling."

(4) Self-definition--20 items

Questions ask about opportunities for student self-exploration and self-definition.

Samples: "A wide variety of special interest courses are taught as part of the regular curriculum, and students select the special interest courses they take."

"Classroom activities relate to real-life situations of the students."

(5) Participation--30 items

Questions ask about the level of student participation in extracurricular activities, participation in school decision making, active participation in class. They also ask about parent participation in school activities.

Samples: "Students are involved, alert, and paying attention in classes."

"Students make contributions to the school and curriculum."

(6) Social Interaction--31 items

Questions ask about positive social interaction at the individual and social levels.

Samples: "Every student has a close and supportive relationship with at least one adult in the school. There is a structured mechanism for accomplishing this ideal."

"The school actively encourages improved race relations and racial understanding."

(7) Physical Activity--6 items

Questions ask about the amenability of the physical setting for accomodating physical activity and opportunities for physical activity.

Sample: "Students have opportunities to move around in the classroom."

(8) Competence and Achievement--35 items

Questions ask about opportunities for students to display diverse talents and recognition for achievement. They also ask about parents', students', and staff's general feelings about the school, remediation strategy, grouping practices, student evaluation, the condition of the building, and whether or not rules are stated positively.

Samples: "Students are well behaved and carry on with appropriate activity without requiring constant adult supervision."

"The building is neat, clean, and in good repair."

This scale lacks face validity.

(9) Structure and Limits--11 items

Items ask whether there is "an approach to discipline that is accepted by the school as a whole" and whether classroom time is well structured so that students know what they are to do.

Sample: "A high percentage of time in the classroom is spent on learning activities."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This assessment device cannot be assessed independently from the school improvement process in which it is embedded. The assessment process benefits staff by clarifying links between research on early adolescent development and practice, providing a structure for school staff to observe one another and broaden their view of the school, and providing an opportunity for school staff to participate in the school improvement process. Staff benefit from the training, the interviewing and observation experience, and the group process of reaching consensus and making recommendations. All but one of the nine areas appear to be carefully developed and based on research on early adolescence, although no technical information about reliability or validity was presented.

The assessment program is based on research on early adolescence and assumes that an understanding of developmental issues for middle school staff is a prerequisite to tackling issues related to curriculum and instruction. The program attempts to bring a new mindset to middle school staff--a mindset that will result in a better fit between school organization and students' needs.

If viewed narrowly as solely an assessment tool, this assessment process is extremely time-consuming. The benefits of this type of assessment would not outweigh the personnel costs if the assessment were not used to support the more general staff development and school improvement aims of the program.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Cincinnati Public Schools--Teacher Survey (1981), Project No. 22

2. Author(s):

   Cincinnati Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Cincinnati Public Schools

4. Available from:

   John H. Grate, Director, Resource Planning and Development Branch,
   Cincinnati Public Schools, 230 E. 9th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

5. Intended Purpose:

   This teacher survey was used in 1984-85 to assess teacher perceptions of school needs in terms of effectiveness and climate factors. Results were used by school leadership teams as a basis for planning staff development for schools in the Cincinnati School Improvement Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

   Fifty-six varied questions ask about school practices, attitudes, and climate (to be rated poor, average, or excellent).

   Samples: "Amount of instructional use of computers in our school."

   "Our school's effort in conserving energy."

   "Effectiveness of our school's science program."

   We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of the scales because we lack information on how the items are scored into scales.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

No strengths were apparent. The materials we received gave no guidance on scoring or interpreting responses to the questions. This questionnaire appears to be specifically for Cincinnati Public Schools. No rationale was provided for item selection. The response formats are awkward and do not always fit the questions.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Cincinnati Field Administrator Survey (1981), Project No. 22

2. Author(s):

Cincinnati Public Schools

3. Institution:

Cincinnati Public Schools

4. Available from:

John H. Grate, Director, Resource Planning and Development Branch,
Cincinnati Public Schools, 230 E. 9th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

5. Intended Purpose:

This survey was used in 1984-85 to assess principal and other local administrator perceptions of school needs in terms of effectiveness and climate factors. Results were used by school leadership teams as a basis for planning staff development in the Cincinnati School Improvement Program.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

Fifty-six items deal with principal ratings of a variety of topics including quality of inservice training, principal morale, parent acceptance of disciplinary procedures, janitorial services, computer support, and other matters.

Sample: "General educational climate in our school."

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of the scales because we lacked information on how the items were scored into scales.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

No strengths were apparent. The materials we received gave no guidance on scoring or interpreting responses to the questions. This questionnaire appears to be specifically for Cincinnati Public Schools. No rationale was provided for item selection. The response formats are awkward and do not always fit the questions.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Cincinnati Parent Survey (1981), Project No. 22

2. Author(s):

   Cincinnati Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   John H. Grate, Director, Resource Planning and Development Branch,
   Cincinnati Public Schools, 230 E. 9th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

5. Intended Purpose:

   This survey was used in 1984-85 to assess parent opinions and perceptions of school needs in terms of effectiveness and climate factors. Results were used by school leadership teams as a basis for planning staff development in the Cincinnati School Improvement Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

   Thirty-six questions cover parent perceptions and satisfaction with the school (responses: Yes, no, undecided).

   Samples: "Are you satisfied with the quality of teaching at your child's school?"

   "Are you satisfied with the amount of homework given your child?"

   We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of the scales because we lacked information on how the items were scored into scales.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

No strengths are apparent. The materials we received gave no guidance on scoring or interpreting responses to the questions. This questionnaire appears to be specifically for Cincinnati Public Schools. No rationale was provided for item selection.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Cincinnati Elementary Student Survey (1981), Project No. 22

2. Author(s):

Cincinnati Public Schools

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

John H. Grate, Director, Resource Planning and Development Branch,
Cincinnati Public Schools, 230 E. 9th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

5. Intended Purpose:

This survey was used in 1984-85 to assess elementary student feelings about themselves and their achievement and their perceptions of school effectiveness and climate factors. Results were used by school leadership teams as a basis for planning staff development in the Cincinnati School Improvement Program.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

Forty-four miscellaneous questions ask about mental health, liking for school, the school itself, parents, and interest in computers (Responses: Yes, no, undecided).

Samples: "I like school."

"Usually I am a happy person."

"I am interested in learning about computers."

"Can you buy drugs at your school?"

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of the scales because we lacked information on how the items were scored into scales.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

No strengths were apparent. The materials we received gave no guidance on scoring or interpreting responses to the questions. This questionnaire appears to be specifically for Cincinnati Public Schools. No rationale was provided for item selection.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Cincinnati Secondary Student Survey (1981), Project No. 22

2. Author(s):

   Cincinnati Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   John H. Grate, Director, Resource Planning and Development Branch,
   Cincinnati Public Schools, 230 E. 9th St., Cincinnati, OH 45202

5. Intended Purpose:

   This survey was used in 1984-85 to assess feelings of secondary students about themselves and their achievement and their perceptions of school effectiveness and climate factors. Results were used by school leadership teams as a basis for planning staff development in the Cincinnati School Improvement Program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

   Fifty-four miscellaneous questions ask about mental health, liking for school, the school itself, parents, and interest in computers. (Responses: Yes, no, undecided).

   Samples: "I am interested in learning about computers."

   "I like school."

   "I am aware of the school's policy on drugs and alcohol."

   "I have school spirit."

   "I have practiced safety procedures (fire, tornado drills) this year."

We could not assess the scale content or the face validity of the scales because we lacked information on how the items were scored into scales.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

No strengths were apparent. The materials we received gave no guidance on scoring or interpreting responses to the questions. This questionnaire appears to be specifically for Cincinnati Public Schools. No rationale was provided for item selection.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Student Survey (1985), Project No. 24

2. Author(s):

   KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center

3. Institution:

   KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center, Kent State University

4. Available from:

   Dr. Benjamin Turner, Director, Liaison and Program Office Kent State Center for Educational Development, Wright Hall, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242

5. Intended Purpose:

   Used by KEDS to assess some perceptions and interests of students in integrated schools in Ohio.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   It asks questions regarding demographic self-identification, previous contacts with school counselors, school success and failure experiences, liking of school, and attitudes toward discipline.

   We could not assess the specific scale content because we received no information on how the instrument is scored.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

    This device is poorly prepared and has hard-to-follow response formats. One can't tell what a good and bad answer is (e.g. whether the number of conferences with a counselor is a measure of counselor quality or student discipline problems). No evidence of reliability or validity was presented.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number:

You're the Teacher: A Building Assessment (1985), Project No. 24

2. Author(s):

Compiled by Benjamin F. Turner

3. Institution:

KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center, Kent State University

4. Available from:

Benjamin F. Turner, Director, KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center,
Wright Hall, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess elementary, intermediate, or high school teachers' and staff's perceptions about school effectiveness and process variables. Assessment results provided a basis for setting priorities in KEDS' work with school districts in Ohio to set priorities in planning for school improvement and desegregation efforts.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

(1) Clear School Mission--10 items

Questions ask about clarity of instructional goals and objectives in the school.

Sample: "The goals are in written form and all staff members are are expected to work toward the goals."

(2) Instructional Leadership--10 items

Questions ask about the supervisory and facilitative style of the principal.

"The principal puts much emphasis on the meaning and use of standardized test results."

(3) High and Reasonable Expectations--10 items

Questions ask about expectations for student success, racial attitudes, teacher behavior, and remediation.

Sample: "In this school provisions are made to give special assistance to students who do not master basic skills."

(4) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task--10 items

Diverse items are related to time allocation, diagnostic testing, pull-out programs, homework, and remediation.

Samples: "Teachers use referenced test items to basic skills where appropriate."

"An hour or more is provided for Mathematics/Arithmetic instruction each day."

This scale lacks face validity.

(5) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress--10 items

Questions about testing and grading practices are mixed with questions about communication with parents and encouragement of students.

Samples: "Students are encouraged to work beyond mere mastery of the basic skills in this school."

"Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school."

This scale lacks face validity.

(6) Parent/Community/School Relations--10 items

Questions ask about school and parent practices involving the interface between school and parents.

Samples: "Most parents would rate this school as a good place for their children to learn."

"Where appropriate, school communications are bilingual for non-English-speaking parents."

This scale lacks face validity.

(7) Safe and Orderly Environment--10 items

Questions ask about school safety, physical condition of the school, student conduct, and discipline practices.

Sample: "This school is a safe and secure place to work."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This instrument is a combination of modified items from the Connecticut instrument (See Project No. 8) and The CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile (Fox, 1976) and items developed from effective school literature by Shoemaker et al. (1982) and Brookover et al. (1982). The rewrites damage the homogeneity/face validity of some item clusters. We did not receive any instructions for administering or scoring or reports of developmental work, and no evidence of reliability or validity was presented.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Building-Level Effectiveness Survey (1982), Project No. 26

2. Author(s):

Robert E. Blum

3. Institution:

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

4. Available from:

Alaska State Department of Education

5. Intended Purpose:

This survey can be completed by a principal, a leadership team, or the whole school staff in grades K-12. It is designed to provide a quick and easy assessment of the extent to which effective schooling practices are being used. The device is referred to as a "preliminary screening instrument" and is not intended for use as a more general climate assessment device.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

(1) Learning Objectives--4 items

Items focus on whether written learning objectives are consistent with district objectives, are communicated to everyone, and are specific to classes or levels.

Sample: "Learning objectives in our building are assigned to particular grades, courses, classes or other units."

(2) Expectations for Student Social Behavior--5 items

Items ask whether disciplinary codes are written, communicated to all, specific, and consistently applied.

Sample: "Expectations for student social behavior in our building include specific consequences or disciplinary action consistent with the code of conduct."

(3) Resources and Materials--5 items

Questions ask about availability and appropriateness of resources.

Sample: "Resources and materials in our building are identified and/or catalogued in such a way that they can be linked to specific objectives."

(4) Instructional Strategies--2 items

Questions ask about alignment of instruction to objectives and consistency of instruction with district policies.

Sample: "Instructional strategies in our building are consistent with district policy and guidelines."

(5) Expectations for Student Learning--2 items

Questions ask about the match between expectations and objectives and communication of objectives.

Sample: "Expectations for student learning in our building are communicated so that priority goals and objectives are clearly understood by students."

(6) Disciplinary Actions--3 items

Questions ask about consistency of disciplinary actions, use of in-school suspension, and the focus of disciplinary actions.

Sample: "Disciplinary actions in our building minimize out-of-school suspensions or expulsions in favor of in-house suspensions."

(7) Expectations for Staff--3 items

Questions ask about standards for staff behavior.

Sample: "Expectations for staff in our building are specified so that staff communicate the belief that all teachers can teach all students."

(8) Use of Time--7 items

Questions ask about allocation and use of instructional time.

Sample: "Student pullouts from academic classes are minimized."

(9) Incentives and Recognition for Student Achievement and Behavior--7 items

Questions ask about the frequency, certainty, appropriateness, desirability, and timing of incentives and recognition for student achievement and behavior.

Sample: "Incentives and recognition for student achievement and behavior in our building provide the opportunity for all students to earn recognition."

(10) Incentives and Recognition for Teaching Excellence--5 items

Questions ask about the frequency and certainty of recognition, and what kinds of behaviors are recognized.

Sample: "Incentives and recognition for teaching excellence in our building include recognition that is public."

(11) Parent Involvement--2 items

Sample: "Parent involvement procedures in our building provide staff assistance to parents in supporting student achievement through training sessions, handbooks and other aids."

(12) Student Assessment Instruments--2 items

Questions ask about alignment of testing to instruction and consistency with district testing programs.

Sample: "Student assessment instruments in our building are coordinated with district instruments to avoid duplication of effort."

(13) Student Assessment Procedures--2 items

Questions ask about reliability and validity of testing procedures and the amount of instructional time lost to testing.

Sample: "Student assessment procedures in our building are designed to minimize disruption of learning time."

(14) Student Assessment Data--2 items

Questions ask about how the school uses student assessment information.

"Student assessment data in our building are used to improve curriculum and instruction at the building level."

(15) Monitoring Staff Performance--6 items

Questions ask about the existence of agreed-upon, standard monitoring procedures, the timeliness and usefulness of feedback to teachers, and the results of monitoring activities.

Sample: "Monitoring of staff performance in our building results in professional growth objectives and the resources to reach them."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This appears to be a flexible, inexpensive device which can be used any way a school wants.

It is a crude checklist, and several of the categories are so broad as to be of questionable utility when the items are averaged. The reliability and validity of the instrument have not been examined.

11. Comments:

Guzzetti (1983) reviewed this instrument and pointed out the following weaknesses: The response format is not standard. All items are stated positively and may produce response bias. Many scales have a very small number of items--almost half of the scales have only two items, and several items are "double-barreled."

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Classroom-Level Effectiveness Survey (1982), Project No. 26

2. Author(s):

   Robert E. Blum

3. Institution:

   Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

4. Available from:

   Alaska Department of Education

5. Intended Purpose:

   This survey can be completed by a principal, a leadership team, or the whole school staff in grades K-12. It is designed to provide a quick and easy assessment of the extent to which effective classroom practices are being used. The device is referred to as a "preliminary screening instrument" and is not intended for use as a more general climate assessment device.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand scored.

9. Content:

   (1) The Curriculum--3 items

   Questions ask about the match between the curriculum and written objectives, students' prior learning, and whether essential objectives are differentiated from nonessential objectives.

   Sample: "The curriculum in my classroom is matched to my students' levels of prior learning as indicated by achievement data."

   (2) Learning Objectives--7 items

   Questions ask about consistency of classroom objectives with district and building guidelines, the testing program and students' prior learning, about their sequencing and how they are grouped and about teacher-directedness and instructional planning.

Sample: "Learning objectives in my classroom are sequenced to support continuity in learning."

(3) Resources and Materials--7 items

Questions ask about the availability, appropriateness, and uses of resources and materials used in the classroom.

Samples: "Resources and materials in my classroom are selected according to district or building guidelines."

"Resources and materials in my classroom are clearly identified in my lesson plans."

(4) Instructional Strategies--7 items

Questions ask about the match between instructional strategies and objectives, district and building guidelines, and achievement tests, use of alternative strategies, appropriateness of instruction for students, and whether or not they allow students to demonstrate self-reliance.

Sample: "Instructional strategies in my classroom give students practice problems very similar in form to problems to be presented on tests."

(5) Expectations for Behavior--3 items

Questions ask about the clarity of classroom rules.

Sample: "Expectations for behavior in my classroom are clearly communicated (taught) from the beginning of the year."

(6) Classroom Routines and Procedures--7 items

Questions ask about the management of noninstructional tasks and physical arrangements.

Sample: "Classroom routines and procedures have been established in my classroom so that students have and use assigned storage space."

(7) Classroom Behavior--7 items

Questions ask about consistency of rule enforcement, appropriateness of rules, and the focus of reprimands.

Sample: "Classroom behavior in my classroom is managed so that disruptive and inappropriate behavior is stopped as quickly as possible without disrupting the rest of the class."

(8) Expectations for Learning--2 items

Questions ask about communication of expectations and student acceptance of standards for achievement.

Sample: "Expectations for learning are communicated in my classroom so that students know the expectations for quantity and quality of work."

(9) Placement and Grouping--2 items

Questions ask about flexibility of grouping and use of achievement data for grouping.

Sample: "Placement and grouping for instruction in my classroom are based on student achievement levels."

(10) Stage Setting--3 items

Questions ask about the use of advance organizers, communication of objectives, and challenges to students.

Sample: "In stage setting in my classroom I use advance organizers and other alerting devices."

(11) Instruction--8 items

Questions ask about success rate, questioning strategies, feedback to students, homework, parental assistance, directions, and practice.

Sample: "Instruction in my classroom allows all students to have the opportunity to respond to my questions."

(12) Use of Time--8 items

Questions ask about allocation of time, engagement rate, use of cues, pacing of instruction, and use of non-class time for make-up work.

Samples: "In controlling use of time in my classroom, I minimize use of time for non-learning activities."

". . . I encourage students to use the clock for self-pacing."

(13) Review and Reteaching--2 items

Questions ask about review and reteaching based on student errors and needs.

Sample: "Review and reteaching in my classroom includes review of key concepts and skills throughout the year."

(14) Student/teacher interactions--2 items

Questions ask about warmth and focus on students.

Sample: "In student/teacher interactions in my classroom, I display warmth and caring."

(15) Incentives and Recognition--8 items

Questions ask about the frequency, certainty, appropriateness, communication to parents, desirability, and timing of incentives and recognition for student achievement and behavior.

Sample: "Incentives and recognition for student achievement and behaviors in my classroom are selected because of their desirability to students."

(16) Student Assessment Instruments--2 items

Questions ask about alignment of testing to instruction and consistency with building and district testing program.

Sample: "Student assessment instruments in my classroom are carefully matched (aligned) to the objectives taught."

(17) Student Assessment Procedures--2 items

Questions ask about the reliability and validity of testing procedures and the amount of instructional time lost to testing.

Sample: "Student assessment procedures follow approved testing practices aimed at ensuring reliability and validity of results."

(18) Student Assessment Data--3 items

Questions ask about the use of data to identify and correct student errors, provide feedback to students, and help the teacher improve curriculum.

Sample: "Student assessment data in my classroom are used to help students in identifying and correcting errors quickly."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This appears to be a flexible, inexpensive device which can be used any way a school wants.

It is a crude checklist, and several of the categories are so broad as to be of questionable utility when the items are averaged. The reliability and validity of the instrument have not been examined. Some of the items do not reflect effective teaching practices.

11. Comments:

Guzzetti (1983) reviewed this instrument and pointed out the following weaknesses: The response format is not standard. All items are stated positively and may produce response bias. Many scales have a very small number of items--almost half of the scales have only two items, and several items are "double-barreled." Guzzetti also noted that, despite claims to the contrary, some of the items do not correspond to recommendations from research on effective teaching, some "positive" teaching behaviors are not, and several research-based effective classroom practices are omitted.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Effective Elementary Schools Analysis (1981), Project No. 27
   Checklists: Troubleshooting, Academic Program, Discipline Features, and Instructional Leadership.

2. Author(s):

   J. T. Pascarelli

3. Institution:

   Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

4. Available from:

   Dr. Joseph Pascarelli, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory,
   300 S.W. 6th Ave., Portland, OR 97204

5. Intended Purpose:

   Checklists covering trouble shooting, academic program, discipline features, and instructional leadership for elementary teachers and advisory council members to use to set priorities for the school when planning for school improvement.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Can be hand-scored or machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

   (1) Instructional Leadership--30 items

   Items ask about several dimensions of principal leadership: emphasis on academics, communications skills, visibility, involvement of parents, staff, and students in school improvement efforts, public relations, etc.

   Sample: "Students know who the principal is and are encouraged to talk with him/her."

   We cannot assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

(2) Academic Program Features Checklist--26 items

Questions ask about clarity of instructional objectives, the match between objectives and assessment, grouping, feedback to students and parents, homework, extra tutoring, use of pullout programs, etc.

Samples: "The textbooks and other materials used for teaching reading are consistent across the grade levels."

"Teachers participate in assignment of students to instructional groups."

We cannot assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

(3) Discipline Features Checklist--24 items

Questions ask about clarity of rules and consequences for breaking them, parental participation in the improvement of a student's behavior, vandalism, student respect for adults, use of positive rewards.

Samples: "The climate of the school is business-like and oriented toward getting work done."

"Rules, procedures, and consequences are made known to parents and students."

We cannot assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

(4) Trouble Shooting Checklist--67 items

Questions ask about a wide range of school characteristics including teacher expectations, use of time, communication with parents, improvement plans and processes.

Samples: "Parents feel welcome in this school."

"There is no strong pressure from parents for this school to change."

We cannot assess the scale content or the face validity of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

These checklists take little time to complete and the format is helpful for prioritizing improvements because it asks for dates for initiation and completion of improvements in each area.

However, the information is not summarized in a way that suggests specific areas that need improvement. For example, the academic program features checklist might be grouped into subcategories--assessment, feedback, rewards, grouping, etc. No validity or reliability information was provided.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from analyses of scales because information on scoring was not provided.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Replicating Success School Climate Survey: Additional Questions for Junior High Schools (1984), Project No. 28

2. Author(s):

   Philadelphia Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Dr. Earline Sloan, Curriculum and Instructional Development, Affective Education Program, Room 321, Board of Education, 21st Street S. of the Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103

5. Intended Purpose:

   This questionnaire assesses junior high teacher perceptions about school practices and orderliness. Assessment results were used to summarize perspectives about the school, to set priorities in school improvement planning, and to evaluate programs in the Replicating Success project.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Responses are hand scored and presented in a summary.

9. Content:

   Twenty-eight items ask about school policies, practices, and supervision and about school orderliness.

   Sample: "Describe the disciplinary climate of the school."

   We cannot assess scale content or face validity because we have no information on scoring.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

    This questionnaire is easy to administer and score. Some questions are taken from the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire.

No information on reliability, validity, scoring, or interpretation of results was provided for this instrument.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales. This instrument was part of a comprehensive assessment which included principal, teacher, and community members. RBS's SAS (see project 31) was also used as part of the assessment.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Replicating Success: Questions to Principals (1984), Project No. 28

2. Author(s):

   Philadelphia Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Dr. Earline Sloan, Curriculum and Instructional Development, Affective Education Program, Room 321, Board of Education, 21st Street S. of the Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103

5. Intended Purpose:

   This questionnaire is used to collect information from principal about staff turnover and disruptions in the school. It was used along with other survey and interview information to help set priorities for school improvement planning in the Replicating Success program.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Six questions ask about staff stability and turnover and any disruptions to continuity of the school's program.

   Sample: "Have there been any other disruptions in the continuity of the student's academic program due to teacher turnover? Be specific."

   We could not assess scale content or face validity because responses were not scored into scales but were presented in summary form.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire could provide some valuable information to a change facilitator about staff turnover.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

This instrument was part of a comprehensive assessment which included principal, teacher, and community members. RBS's SAS (see project 31) was also used as part of the assessment.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Replicating Success Needs Assessment: Community Interview (1984),
   Project No. 28

2. Author(s):

   Philadelphia Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Dr. Earline Sloan, Curriculum and Instructional Development, Affective Education Program, Room 321, Board of Education, 21st Street S. of the Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103

5. Intended Purpose:

   This interview form was used in the Replicating Success program in the Philadelphia schools to assess parent and community perceptions about their experiences with and sources of information about the school. Information from the community interviews and principal and teacher interviews were combined to provide a basis for setting priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Twenty-nine items mostly open-ended questions ask parents of school children about their experiences with and sources of information about the school.

   Sample: "How do you feel overall about the education ____ is receiving at ____?"

   We could not assess scale content or face validity because responses were not scored into scales but were presented in summary form.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This device gives a change facilitator a list of questions to ask to assess parent experiences with the school. This device is labor intensive and cumbersome. Materials are not attractive. No psychometric information or guidance on administration or scoring is provided. Judgment is required in scoring and interpretation. Some parent questions seem intrusive.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

This instrument was part of a comprehensive assessment which included principal, teacher, and community members. RBS's SAS (see project 31) was also used as part of the assessment.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Replicating Success Needs Assessment: Interview (1984), Project No. 28

2. Author(s):

   Philadelphia Public Schools

3. Institution:

   Same as above.

4. Available from:

   Dr. Earline Sloan, Curriculum and Instructional Development, Affective Education Program, Room 321, Board of Education, 21st Street S. of the Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103

5. Intended Purpose:

   The interview assesses teacher and staff perceptions about the school climate and organizational processes, problems, priorities for improvement, and understanding of the Replicating Success program. Facilitators combine these results with those from community and principal interviews to provide a basis for setting priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   Eighteen items ask teachers about their work experience at this and other schools, their perceptions about school goals, climate, and organizational processes, the strengths and weaknesses of the school, priorities for change, and understanding of the program.

   Sample: "Would you send your child to this school? Why? Why not?"

   We could not assess scale content or face validity because responses were not scored into scales but were presented in summary form.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The interview gives a change facilitator a list of questions to ask teachers and staff in interviews to become familiar with the school. The total assessment process also includes the principal and community.

The interview process is labor intensive and cumbersome. We received no psychometric information or guidance on administration or scoring. It requires judgment in scoring and interpretation.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

This instrument was part of a comprehensive assessment which included principal, teacher, and community members. RBS's SAS (see project 31) is also used as part of the assessment.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Replicating Success Needs Assessment: Principal Interview Form--Parts I, II, and III (1984), Project No. 28

2. Author(s):

Philadelphia Public Schools

3. Institution:

Same as above.

4. Available from:

Dr. Earline Sloan, Curriculum and Instructional Development, Affective Education Program, Room 321, Board of Education, 21st Street S. of the Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103

5. Intended Purpose:

The interview assesses principal opinions about school goals and processes and perceptions about the climate and organizational processes in the school. Facilitators combined these results with those from community and teacher interviews to provide a basis for setting priorities for school improvement planning in the Replicating Success program.

6. Reliability Information:

None provided.

7. Validity Information:

None provided.

8. Scoring:

Hand-scored.

9. Content:

Fifty-three items ask about principal's views on education and the school.

Samples: "How do you feel about classroom visitations between teachers?"

"What do you see as this school's key problems? How have they changed over the past several years?"

We could not assess scale content or face validity because responses were not scored into scales but were presented in summary form.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This interview gives a change facilitator a list of questions to ask a principal in an interview to become familiar with the school. The whole assessment battery includes parents and teachers as well. Results are summarized with indications of the number and source (teacher, parent, para, etc.) of responses to questions.

The interview process is labor-intensive and cumbersome. Materials are not attractive. We received no psychometric information or guidance on administration or scoring. It requires judgment in scoring and interpretation. The principal interview is very lengthy and the English usage needs improvement.

11. Comments:

This instrument was excluded from the analysis of scales.

This instrument was part of a comprehensive assessment which included principal, teacher, and community members. RBS's SAS (see project 31) is also used as part of the assessment.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Assessment Survey (1984), Project No. 31

2. Author(s):

Bruce L. Wilson, William A. Firestone, & Robert E. Herriott

3. Institution:

Research for Better Schools

4. Available from:

Research for Better Schools, 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire for teachers in elementary and secondary schools assesses perceptions of nine school organizational dimensions. Assessment results are used to identify strengths and weaknesses, stimulate discussion, and set priorities for school improvement planning.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha reliabilities in the construction samples for eight of the nine dimensions range from .76 to .96 (average = .88) Alpha is not reported for the other dimension (Goal Consensus) because the way this score is computed precludes straightforward computation of its internal consistency. Retest reliabilities are not provided.

7. Validity Information:

All items appear to have face validity. Evidence of content validity and convergent/discriminant validity are presented in the technical manual.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by a scoring service.

9. Content:

(1) Goal Consensus--7 items

Assesses the degree of convergence among teachers in the importance of seven student outcomes: basic skills, self-esteem, appreciating and striving for excellence, critical and original thinking, respect for authority, vocational understanding and skills, understanding others.

(2) Facilitative Leadership--6 items (alpha = .96)

Items ask about the leadership style of the principal.

Sample: "Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems."

(3) Centralization of Influence, Classroom Instruction--5 items (alpha = .83)

Items cover teacher and principal influence in matters related to classroom instruction. Relative influence is estimated by subtraction.

Sample: "Selecting required texts or other materials."

(4) Centralization of Influence, Curriculum and Resources--5 items (alpha = .76)

Items concern the relative influence of principals versus teachers in making decisions about allocation of resources, scheduling, curriculum, faculty assignments, and the utilization of space.

Sample: "Determining the school's schedule (including teacher prep. periods)."

(5) Vertical Communication--6 items (alpha = .90)

Items assess the frequency of discussions between teachers and administrators on topics ranging from lessons to resources.

Sample: "Improving discipline generally."

(6) Horizontal Communication--6 items (alpha = .88)

Items ask about communication among teachers on topics ranging from lessons to resources.

Sample: "Maintaining or improving positive relations with parents."

(7) Staff Conflict--7 items (alpha = .89)

Questions ask about the frequency of disputes among teachers on topics ranging from the teaching of controversial material to criteria for evaluating teachers.

Sample: "Promotion of particular teachers."

(8) Student Discipline--7 items (alpha = .90)

Items assess the degree of orderliness in the school environment.

Sample: "The atmosphere is orderly and businesslike."

(9) Teaching Behavior--6 items (alpha = .95)

Items provide estimates of the extent to which the schools/teachers encourage students to work hard, attend equally to all students, and experiment with new methods.

Sample: "Plan their classes so that different learning needs of the student can be met."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This assessment instrument is based on a useful theory of the school as an organization and on careful and competent research. The reliabilities are uniformly high and the validity evidence suggests that, for the most part, the scales measure unique dimensions of school organization. It is especially useful in diagnosing the need for team-building kinds of organization development interventions and in evaluating such interventions. It is probably the best available instrument for this purpose.

The reliability coefficients reported in the manual may be inflated because they are based on the same sample used to select items (86 items were pared to 55 in a sample of 61 schools). But the device's author reports that the reliabilities reported in the manual are not substantially different from reliabilities recomputed in a larger sample. Some of the validity evidence undermines confidence in the measures. For example, 54% of the variance in Goal Consensus is accounted for by age-grade level and SES, and this measure is not significantly correlated with student social and academic behavior in high schools.

11. Comments:

The latest version of the SAS includes measures of Teacher Expectations and Teacher Evaluation.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Indicators of Effective Schools--Parent Survey (1982), Project No. 33

2. Author(s):

   Name withheld.

3. Institution:

   Name withheld.

4. Available from:

   No longer available.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This survey was used in elementary, middle, and junior high schools to assess parent perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators. Assessment results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate programs for the annual school and district improvement reports required by state law.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   (1) Positive School Climate--9 items

   Items ask about liking for the school and general impressions about the school.

   Samples: "School events are well attended."

   "There is someone in this school on whom I can always count."

   (2) The School's Emphasis on Academics, Including Basic Skills--7 items

Assesses parent involvement, use of parent volunteers, student recognition, communication with parents about academic work, clarity of academic goals, the coverage of the curriculum, and expectations for students.

Samples: "Parents have an opportunity to see their child's work."

"Many teachers use parent volunteers in the classroom."

This scale lacks face validity.

(3) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress and Its Utilization in Curriculum Planning--5 items

Items ask about the availability of aggregate test scores, frequency of testing, clarity of purpose of testing, clarity of expectations for students, teacher responsiveness.

Samples: "Students have a clear understanding of homework expectations."

"Frequent testing is done to determine progress."

This scale lacks face validity.

(4) High Expectations Related to Student Achievement--7 items

Items ask about expectations for students' attendance, behavior and learning, use of rewards, promotion standards, program availability and teachers as role models.

Samples: "The principal and teachers expect students to learn."

"There are programs for students of all ability levels."

This scale lacks face validity.

(5) Positive Home-School Relations--10 items

Items ask about different aspects of parent/community involvement in the school, communication between school and home, school activities aimed at the community, assistance to parents in helping students.

Sample: "Programs exist in which some school staff go to students' homes."

This scale lacks face validity.

(6) Instructional Leadership--8 items

Items ask about these principal qualities: communication, firmness, charisma, accessibility as well as these practices: classroom visitation, recognition of success.

Samples: "The principal is easily available to staff and the public."

"The principal recognizes academic success."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Item groups were labeled to coincide with the dimensions schools were required to assess according to state law. The school climate measures appear to have face validity.

Four of the six groups of items lack even face validity. No developmental work appears to have been done. No evidence of reliability or validity was provided. Many items were taken from the Colorado State Department of Education's "Indicators of Quality Schools" instrument (see project 6), but there was little correspondence in the item groupings used in the two instruments.

11. Comments:

This instrument was put together hastily in response to new state legislation which mandated that schools conduct needs assessments related to research on effective schools. The instrument's authors recognized the instrument's problems and discarded it after one year of field testing. A new instrument is currently being developed with more attention to concerns of reliable and valid measurement.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Indicators of Effective Schools--Student Survey (1982), Project No. 33

2. Author(s):

   Name withheld.

3. Institution:

   Name withheld.

4. Available from:

   No longer available.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This survey was used in elementary, middle, and junior high schools to assess student perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators. Assessment results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate programs for the annual school and district improvement reports required by state law.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand scored.

9. Content:

   (1) Positive School Climate--16 items

   Questions ask about the affective climate of the schools and about the orderliness of the environment.

   Samples: "Most people at school are kind."

   "The noise levels in the hall are low."

   (2) The School's Emphasis on Academics Including the Basic Skills--7 items

Items ask about rewards, recognition for success, motivation to learn, teacher's willingness to help students.

Samples: "There are current displays of student work on bulletin boards, in halls and in classrooms."

"Teachers are willing to help students who don't understand work."

This scale lacks face validity.

(3) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress--9 items

Items ask about teacher responsiveness, clarity of teacher expectations, teacher's strategies for discussion, active participation of students, and feedback.

Sample: "Teachers include all students during discussion and review."

This scale lacks face validity.

(4) High Expectations Related to Student Achievement--9 items

Most items ask about expectations of students. Some ask about student opportunities to take responsibility, the amount of independent work, and teacher use of praise.

Sample: "Students in this school are expected to take care of their own property, and the property of others."

(5) Positive Home-School Relations--7 items

Items ask about home-school communication, parent/community involvement in the school, parents' feelings about the school.

Sample: "My parents feel comfortable about coming to school."

(6) Instructional Leadership--12 items

The items ask about academic standards, clarity of school goals, time allocated for teaching, appearance of grounds and buildings, clarity of attendance and discipline policy, student involvement etc.

Sample: "The buildings and grounds are in good repair and show evidence of upkeep."

This scale lacks face validity.

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Item groups were labeled to coincide with the dimensions schools were required to assess according to state law. The school climate measures appear to have face validity.

Half of the groups of items lack even face validity. No developmental work appears to have been done. No validity or reliability evidence was provided. Many items were taken from the Colorado State Department of Education's "Indicators of Quality Schools" instrument (see project 6), but there was little correspondence in the item groupings used in the two instruments.

11. Comments:

This instrument was put together hastily in response to new state legislation which mandated that schools conduct needs assessments related to research on effective schools. The instrument's authors recognized the instrument's problems and discarded it after one year of field testing. A new instrument is currently being developed with more attention to concerns of reliable and valid measurement.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

   Indicators of Effective Schools--Teacher Survey (1982), Project No. 33

2. Author(s):

   Name withheld.

3. Institution:

   Name withheld.

4. Available from:

   No longer available.

5. Intended Purpose:

   This survey was used in elementary, middle, and junior high schools to assess teacher perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators. Assessment results were used to set priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate programs for the annual school and district improvement reports required by state law.

6. Reliability Information:

   None provided.

7. Validity Information:

   None provided.

8. Scoring:

   Hand-scored.

9. Content:

   (1) Positive School Climate--34 items

   Questions ask about the affective climate of the school.

   Sample: "Students feel that administrators and staff understand and respond to their needs."

   (2) The School's Emphasis on Academics, Including Basic Skills--31 items

   Items are designed to assess teacher classroom management skills: student involvement in learning, behavior management, efficient time use.

Sample: "Disruptive noise levels in the hall are low."

This scale lacks face validity.

(3) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress and Its Utilization in Curriculum Planning--44 items

Items assess teachers' use of frequent monitoring and provision of corrective instruction. They also assess school-level use of assessment data in curriculum planning.

Sample: "Tests are used which allow comparison of at least some items with national performance."

This scale lacks face validity.

(4) High Expectations Related to Student Achievement--16 items

Items ask general opinions about teacher expectations and appropriateness of practices.

Sample: "There is an appropriate use of rewards, praise and appreciation of all students."

This scale lacks face validity

(5) Positive Home-School Relations--15 items

Items assess parents' support for their childrens' educational activities and parental and community involvement in school activities."

Sample: "Teachers inform parents of their child's educational progress and indicate where improvement is needed."

This scale lacks face validity.

(6) Instructional Leadership of the Principal--18 items

Items assess the following leadership qualities: planning, providing for staff development, charisma, providing feedback and rewards to staff, accessibility, responsiveness, good communication skills, democratic approach.

Sample: "The principal works with dissenting individuals and groups to reach a working consensus."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

Item groups were labeled to coincide with the dimensions schools were required to assess according to state law. The school climate measures appear to have face validity.

Half of the groups of items lack even face validity. No developmental work appears to have been done. No validity or reliability evidence was provided. Many items were taken from the Colorado State Department of Education's "Indicators of Quality Schools" instrument (see project 6), but there was little correspondence in the item groupings used in the two instruments.

11. Comments:

This instrument was put together hastily in response to new state legislation which mandated that schools conduct needs assessments related to research on effective schools. The instrument's authors recognized the instrument's problems and discarded it after one year of field testing. A new instrument is currently being developed with more attention to concerns of reliable and valid measurement.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

Climate Effectiveness Inventory I (CEI, 1983), Project No. 35

2. Author(s):

Willis J. Furtwengler

3. Institution:

Research and Service Institute, Inc.

4. Available from:

Dr. Willis J. Furtwengler, Research and Service Institute, Suite 233, 2 Maryland Farms, Brentwood, TN 37027

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire assesses perceptions of teachers about school discipline, climate, and the problem-solving process in elementary and secondary schools. Results are used to guide plans for staff development.

6. Reliability Information:

Retest reliability evidence provided by the author of the inventory (Furtwengler & Redelheim, 1986) was based on versions of the instrument other than that included in our study, involved student and parent respondents as well as teachers, was calculated using individuals rather than schools as the unit of analysis, and was based on small numbers of respondents and short retest intervals (two and four weeks).

7. Validity Information:

Content validity was established through a series of revisions which used expert panels to classify items and judge their suitability for measuring the intended constructs, field tests to identify unclear items, and factor analyses to confirm the anticipated factor structure. The content validation process is described in Furtwengler and Redelheim (1986).

Convergent and discriminant validity evidence reported in the same document (a) did not specify the unit of analysis for the studies, i.e., whether the correlations were derived using school scores or teacher scores (Judging from the number of schools involved in each study, it appears that only one of the five studies summarized used the school as the unit of analysis. This study involved 18 schools. Others involved 2, 4, 10 and an unknown number of schools); and (b) the version of the CEI used in each study is not specified, so the relevance of the study to the current form of the CEI is uncertain.

The evidence presented generally favored the CEI and suggested that some of the CEI scale scores were correlated with teachers' perceptions of their schools as task-oriented and supportive of intellectual development, teachers' humanistic ideologies, teachers' perceptions of openness of the school climate, suspension and discipline referral rates, teacher and student absenteeism, and school size.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by a scoring service.

9. Content:

The instrument contains seven scales. Each scale is scored to reflect the teachers' perceptions of the school as it now is and their expectations for how their school should be. Discrepancy scores are derived by subtracting the two scales.

(1) The School's Philosophy

This scale measures the extent to which the school emphasizes student self-governing activities or student obedience and dependency activities.

Sample: "I believe that my school is developing students who rely on their own judgment in making decisions."

(2) The Maturity of Behavior

This scale measures the extent to which the school emphasizes the process of placing responsibility for a person's behavior on the person.

Sample: "I believe that my school is providing personal responsibilities to students who act appropriately."

(3) The Response to Misdeeds

This scale measures the extent to which the school emphasizes the use of penalties for inappropriate behaviors.

Sample: "I believe that my school is providing appropriate punishments and penalties to students who violate school rules."

(4) The Response to Good Deeds

This scale measures the extent to which the school emphasizes the use of rewards for appropriate behaviors.

Sample: "I believe that my school is providing rewards to students as a result of their appropriate behavior."

(5) The Source of School Problems

This scale measures the extent to which the school is regarded as the source of school problems in relation to the community as a source of school problems.

Sample: "I believe that my school is attributing the causes of most school problems to sources within the school environment."

(6) The Responsibility for Improvement

This scale measures the extent to which school personnel view themselves as being responsible for improving the climate of the school.

Sample: "I believe that my school is placing the responsibility for correcting inappropriate behavior in school on the school personnel."

(7) The Openness to Problem Solving

This scale measures the extent to which the school emphasizes the orderly collection and utilization of data to solve school problems, and the openness to community input in solving the school's problems.

Sample: "I believe that my school is encouraging joint school-community participation in addressing the broad aspects of school problems."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

The instrument is short and easy to complete and contains valid measures of the disciplinary climate and the problem-solving process in the school. The feedback provided to schools includes discrepancy scores, reflecting differences between teachers' perceptions and expectations for what their school should be like as well as normative information on how the school looks relative to about 200 other schools that have completed the instrument.

The instrument would benefit from additional validity studies performed using the school as the unit of analysis and from proper reliability assessments.

11. Comments:

This device is usually used as part of a more general school improvement process. School districts contract with the author of this instrument to train change agents, facilitate meetings, and provide information for the school improvement process.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Auxiliary/Paraprofessional Personnel Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 36

2. Author(s):

Dept. of Research, Testing, and Statistics and the School Improvement Program Evaluation Subcommittee, Norfolk Public Schools

3. Institution:

Norfolk Public Schools

4. Available from:

Anna G. Dodson, Director, Research, Testing and Statistics, School Administration Building, P. O. Box 1357, Norfolk, VA 23501

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess the perceptions of auxiliary and paraprofessional personnel about effective school and school climate indicators in elementary schools in the SPIRAL program in the Norfolk Public Schools. Assessment results were used to help in setting priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate program results.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the six scales ranged from .44 to .89 (average = .69). No retest reliabilities were provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

Panels of expert judges were used to increase the face validity of the measures. One panel matched candidate items against descriptions of the dimensions intended to be measured. Items not unanimously matched were discarded. Another panel rated items for appropriateness. Items with average ratings or below were discarded. The resulting instruments were field-tested to take into account comments by the principals and teachers in the field-test schools.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by a school system.

9. Content:

(1) Administrative Style--6 items (alpha = .80)

Questions ask about principal behavior, accessiblity, and style, clarity of school grades and student attitudes.

Sample: "There is a clearly defined chain of command in the school."

(2) High Expectations--4 items (alpha = .67)

Sample: "Teachers in this school expect their students to do well."

(3) School Climate--19 items (alpha = .89)

Items cover a broad range of perceptions relevant to climate and interpersonal relations.

Samples: "Children at this school seem to enjoy school."

"The principal of this school is dedicated."

(4) Basic Skills--4 items (alpha = .71)

Items ask about the quality of instruction.

Sample: "Reading instruction at this school is excellent."

This scale lacks face validity.

(5) Monitoring--3 items (alpha = .44)

Questions ask about the regularity of informing parents about pupil progress, school-wide testing, and the clarity of information for parents.

Sample: "Written progress reports to parents are understandable."

This scale lacks face validity.

(6) Resources--4 items (alpha = .61)

Two questions about access to resources to do one's job. One question about the adequacy of the library and one about the principal as a resource person.

Sample: "The principal executes all requests for repairs and materials promptly."

"There are sufficient supplies and materials in the school for all personnel to perform their assigned duties."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is inexpensive to administer and score and detailed profiles are provided for the schools. The total program assesses the views of most groups concerned with the school--teachers, students, administrators, other school staff, and parents.

Two of the six scales lack face validity for the construct they are said to measure. For example, some questions about basic skills refer more to excellence and some items about monitoring really cover the quality of parent communications.

11. Comments:

Four secondary-level questionnaires have been developed by Norfolk Public Schools. These questionnaires include, in addition to the six scales included in the elementary questionnaires, measures of School Mission and Parent/Community Support.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Parent Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 36

2. Author(s):

Dept. of Research, Testing, and Statistics and the School Improvement Program Evaluation Subcommittee, Norfolk Public Schools

3. Institution:

Norfolk Public Schools

4. Available from:

Anna G. Dodson, Director, Research, Testing and Statistics, School Administration Building, P. O. Box 1357, Norfolk, VA 23501

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess parent perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators in elementary schools in the SPIRAL program in the Norfolk Public Schools. Assessment results were used to help in setting priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate program results.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilties for the six scales ranged from .45 to .93 (average = .64). No retest reliabilities were provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

Panels of expert judges were used to increase the face validity of the measures. One panel matched candidate items against descriptions of the dimensions intended to be measured. Items not unanimously matched were discarded. Another panel rated items for appropriateness. Items with average ratings or below were discarded. The resulting instruments were field-tested to take into account comments by the principals and teachers in the field-test schools.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

(1) Administrative Style--5 items (alpha = .48)

Diverse questions ask about homework, principal leadership, and school goals.

Samples: "The children in this school are getting plenty of homework."

"Every parent connected with this school has access to the written school-wide goals."

This scale lacks face validity.

(2) High Expectations--3 items (alpha = .78)

Items ask about the extent to which teachers have high expectations of students.

Sample: "Teachers at this school demand the best of each student."

(3) School Climate--22 items (alpha = .93)

Items ask about diverse aspects of school climate plus reports of interaction with the school, child satisfaction, and responsiveness to parents.

Samples: "Driveways and parking areas are effectively supervised at this school."

"I understand the rules and policies of the school."

(4) Basic Skills--5 items (alpha = .45)

Items cover parent perceptions of the quality of instruction.

Sample: "This school's instructional program is excellent."

This scale lacks face validity.

(5) Monitoring--4 items (alpha = .71)

Items ask about the extent to which parents feel informed by the school about their child.

Sample: "The scores reported to parents are clear and understandable."

This scale lacks face validity.

(6) Resources--3 items (alpha = .48)

Items ask if the school is well-equipped, the library is adequate, and if the parent does volunteer work in the school.

Sample: "This school's library is adequate."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is inexpensive to administer and score and detailed profiles are provided for the schools. The total program assesses the views of most groups concerned with the school--teachers, students, administrators, other school staff, and parents.

The reliabilities for three scales are low and three scales lack even face validity.

11. Comments:

Four secondary-level questionnaires have been developed by Norfolk Public Schools. These questionnaires include, in addition to the six scales included in the elementary questionnaires, measures of School Mission and Parent/Community Support.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Pupil Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 36

2. Author(s):

Dept. of Research, Testing, and Statistics and the School Improvement Program Evaluation Subcommittee, Norfolk Public Schools

3. Institution:

Norfolk Public Schools

4. Available from:

Anna G. Dodson, Director, Research, Testing and Statistics, School Administration Building, P. O. Box 1357, Norfolk, VA 23501

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess student perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators in elementary schools in the SPIRAL program in the Norfolk Public Schools. Assessment results were used to help in setting priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate program results.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the six scales ranged from .13 to .69 (average = .43). No retest reliabilities were provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

Panels of expert judges were used to increase the face validity of the measures. One panel matched candidate items against descriptions of the dimensions intended to be measured. Items not unanimously matched were discarded. Another panel rated items for appropriateness. Items with average ratings or below were discarded. The resulting instruments were field-tested to take into account comments by the principals and teachers in the field-test schools.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

(1) Administrative Style--6 items (alpha = .47)

Items ask about pupil perceptions of the principal and how he/she runs the school.

Samples: "The principal of this school does not put up with nonsense."

"The principal knows my name."

(2) High Expectations--12 items (alpha = .69)

Items ask about teacher (and principal) expectations.

Samples: "My teacher thinks I can learn everything."

"My teacher expects me to know the answer when he/she calls on me."

(3) School Climate--17 items (alpha = .65)

A diverse set of questions ask about the teacher, liking for school, and school climate.

Samples: "I like my teacher."

"My teacher treats all pupils fairly."

"I feel safe and secure in this school."

This scale lacks face validity.

(4) Basic Skills--5 items (alpha = .32)

Items ask about the instructional content, student effort, attitude about learning, and teacher encouragement.

Samples: "We are taught reading and mathematics every day."

"Learning is serious business, but it is fun."

This scale lacks face validity.

(5) Monitoring--5 items (alpha = .30)

Questions ask about teacher feedback on schoolwork plus one item on coaching for test-taking.

Samples: "My teacher grades homework assignments."

"My teacher always tells us how to do tests."

"We have been taught how to take tests."

(6) Resources--5 items (alpha = .13)

Items ask about the availabilty of instructional resources.

Samples: "My teacher has plenty of chalk and board erasers."

"I do not have to share textbooks."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is inexpensive to administer and score and detailed profiles are provided for the schools. The total program assesses the views of most groups concerned with the school--teachers, students, administrators, other school staff, and parents.

Items in the school climate and basic skills sections appear too diverse to accurately measure the intended dimension, and the reliability coefficients are generally low.

11. Comments:

Four secondary-level questionnaires have been developed by Norfolk Public Schools. These questionnaires include, in addition to the six scales included in the elementary questionnaires, measures of School Mission and Parent/Community Support.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Special Program/Resource Teacher Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 36

2. Author(s):

Dept. of Research, Testing, and Statistics and the School Improvement Program Evaluation Subcommittee, Norfolk Public Schools

3. Institution:

Norfolk Public Schools

4. Available from:

Anna G. Dodson, Director, Research, Testing and Statistics, School
Administration Building, P. O. Box 1357, Norfolk, VA 23501

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess the perceptions of special program and resource teachers about effective school and school climate indicators in elementary schools in the SPIRAL program in the Norfolk Public Schools. Assessment results were used to help in setting priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate program results.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the six scales ranged from .78 to .87 (average = .84). No retest reliabilities were provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

Panels of expert judges were used to increase the face validity of the measures. One panel matched candidate items against descriptions of the dimensions intended to be measured. Items not unanimously matched were discarded. Another panel rated items for appropriateness. Items with average ratings or below were discarded. The resulting instruments were field-tested to take into account comments by the principals and teachers in the field-test schools.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

(1) Administrative Style--15 items (alpha = .86)

Questions ask about a variety of administrator styles and practices such as lesson plan reviews, homework policies, observations, feedback, coordination of special programs with the regular program, and accessibility to parents.

Sample: "The instruction given to students by special-program/resource teachers is coordinated with that provided by regular classroom teachers."

"The principal at this school is accessible and responsive to parents."

(2) High Expectations--9 items (alpha = .78)

Questions ask about the effect of students' home backgrounds on teacher expectations for achievement, proportion of children retained, expectations for mastery of skills, and high school graduation.

Samples: "Students scoring in the lowest quartile on standardized tests will make proportionately as much progress as students scoring in the higher quartiles."

"In this school, low-achieving students are called upon to answer questions as often as other students."

(3) School Climate--15 items (alpha = .87)

A variety of questions ask about school and classroom climate, interpersonal relations, and judgments about parental perceptions.

Sample: "The principal of this school is accessible to special program personnel."

(4) Basic Skills--13 items (alpha = .85)

Questions ask about school and teacher practices related to instruction.

Sample: "At this school, there is an established policy of coordination for regular instruction and special-program instruction in reading and mathematics."

(5) Monitoring--12 items (alpha = .84)

Items cover the use of standardized tests in planning and teacher practices in monitoring testing, and feeding back information to students.

Sample: "Resource and special-program teachers monitor pupil performance."

(6) Resources--11 items (alpha = .85)

Diverse questions relate to resources available, inservice training, community, and parental involvement.

Sample: "In this school, resource and special program teachers are provided satisfactory space in which to work."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is inexpensive to administer and score and detailed profiles are provided for the schools. The total program assesses the views of most groups concerned with the school--teachers, students, administrators, other school staff, and parents. All scales appear face valid and have high internal consistency.

11. Comments:

Four secondary-level questionnaires have been developed by Norfolk Public Schools. These questionnaires include, in addition to the six scales included in the elementary questionnaires, measures of School Mission and Parent/Community Support.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Program Questionnaires-Teacher Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 36

2. Author(s):

Dept. of Research, Testing, and Statistics and the School Improvement Program Evaluation Subcommittee, Norfolk Public Schools

3. Institution:

Norfolk Public Schools

4. Available from:

Anna G. Dodson, Director, Research, Testing and Statistics, School Administration Building, P. O. Box 1357, Norfolk, VA 23501

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess teacher perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators in elementary schools in the SPIRAL program in the Norfolk Public Schools. Assessment results were used to help in setting priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate program results.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the six scales ranged from .74 to .88 (average = .84). No retest reliabilities were provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

Panels of expert judges were used to increase the face validity of the measures. One panel matched candidate items against descriptions of the dimensions intended to be measured. Items not unanimously matched were discarded. Another panel rated items for appropriateness. Items with average ratings or below were discarded. The resulting instruments were field-tested to take into account comments by the principals and teachers in the field-test schools.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by school system.

9. Content:

(1) Administrative Style--17 items (alpha = .88)

Questions cover a variety of administrator styles and practices and related matters, e.g., lesson plan reviews and homework policies.

Sample: "This school operates under a formalized set of goals and objectives."

(2) High Expectations-- 9 items (alpha = .74)

Items ask about personal beliefs and estimates of staff beliefs and practices related to expectations, especially for low SES/ability students.

Sample: "The principal of this school holds a high level of expectation for all."

(3) School Climate--18 items (alpha = .88)

A variety of questions ask about school and classroom climate, interpersonal relations, and judgments about parental perceptions. Same as the principal scale but four additional items. The additional items tend to diffuse the focus somewhat.

Sample (additional item): "Teachers at this school usually find the principal accessible and responsive."

(4) Basic Skills--18 items (alpha = .86)

Items ask about school and teacher practices related to instruction. Items are the same as in the principal scale, but there are two additional items.

Samples: "Pull-out programs do not disrupt or interfere with basic skills instruction."

"Each day students are engaged in meaningful learning tasks which bring success to them."

(5) Monitoring--13 items (alpha = .83)

Items cover the use of standardized tests in planning and teacher practices in monitoring testing and feeding back information.

Sample: "All classroom teachers understand and use tests effectively in planning and evaluating basic skills instruction."

(6) Resources--10 items (alpha = .84)

Diverse questions relate to resource availability and other matters--inservice training, community, and parental involvement.

Sample: "Inservice training provided to teachers is viewed as adequate."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is inexpensive to administer and score and detailed profiles are provided for the schools. The total program assesses the views of most groups concerned with the school--teachers, students, administrators, other school staff, and parents. All scales appear face valid and have high internal consistency.

11. Comments:

Four secondary-level questionnaires have been developed by Norfolk Public Schools. These questionnaires include, in addition to the six scales included in the elementary questionnaires, measures of School Mission and Parent/Community Support.

1. Instrument Title and Project Number

School Improvement Program Questionnaires--Elementary Principal Questionnaire (1984), Project No. 36

2. Author(s):

Dept. of Research, Testing, and Statistics and the School Improvement Program Evaluation Subcommittee, Norfolk Public Schools

3. Institution:

Norfolk Public Schools

4. Available from:

Anna G. Dodson, Director, Research, Testing and Statistics, School
Administration Building, P. O. Box 1357, Norfolk, VA 23501

5. Intended Purpose:

This questionnaire was used to assess principal perceptions of effective school and school climate indicators in elementary schools in the SPIRAL program in the Norfolk Public Schools. Assessment results were used to help in setting priorities for school improvement planning and to evaluate program results.

6. Reliability Information:

Alpha internal reliabilities for the six scales ranged from .53 to .78 (average = .69). No retest reliabilities were provided for this instrument.

7. Validity Information:

Panels of expert judges were used to increase the face validity of the measures. One panel matched candidate items against descriptions of the dimensions intended to be measured. Items not unanimously matched were discarded. Another panel rated items for appropriateness. Items with average ratings or below were discarded. The resulting instruments were field-tested to take into account comments by the principals and teachers in the field test schools.

8. Scoring:

Machine-scored by the school system.

9. Content:

(1) Administrative Style--16 items (alpha = .73)

Items ask about principal behavior and administrative style.

Samples: "The principal at this school is accessible and responsive to parents."

"This school has a uniform policy defining homework expectations which is clear to students and parents."

(2) High Expectations--9 items (alpha = .53)

Items ask about the principal's personal beliefs and estimates of staff beliefs and practices related to expectations, especially for low SES/ability students.

Sample: "The principal of this school holds a high level of expectation for all."

(3) School Climate--14 items (alpha = .75)

Questions ask about school and classroom climate, interpersonal relations, and judgments about parental perceptions.

Sample: "Broken things in this building are repaired promptly."

(4) Basic Skills--16 items (alpha = .78)

Questions ask about school and teacher practices related to instruction.

Samples: "Pull-out programs do not disrupt or interfere with basic skills instruction."

"Each day students are engaged in meaningful learning tasks which bring success to them."

(5) Monitoring--11 items (alpha = .60)

Items deal with the use of standardized tests in planning and teacher practices in monitoring testing, and feeding back information.

Sample: "All classroom teachers understand and use tests effectively in planning and evaluating basic skills instruction."

(6) Resources--9 items (alpha = .76)

Diverse questions relate to resource availability and other matters--inservice training, community, and parental involvement.

Sample: "Inservice training provided to teachers is viewed as adequate."

10. Strengths and Weaknesses:

This questionnaire is inexpensive to administer and score and detailed profiles are provided for the schools. The total program assesses the views of most groups concerned with the school--teachers, students, administrators, other school staff, and parents. All scales appear face valid and most have high internal consistency. High Expectations and Monitoring have lower than desirable internal consistencies.

11. Comments:

Four secondary-level questionnaires have been developed by Norfolk Public Schools. These questionnaires include, in addition to the six scales included in the elementary questionnaires, measures of School Mission and Parent/Community Support.

APPENDIX B

School Climate Measurement Study Data Collection Form

Name of Instrument____

Author____

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED FOR EACH INSTRUMENT

The following questions apply to an entire instrument rather than for specific measures within an instrument.

Familiarize yourself with the questions, then read all of the materials for the instrument. Then go back and answer each question, noting in the margin the location of the information which allowed you to answer the question.
If you have reason to believe that some information you need is available but that we do not have it, check our original letter requesting the information.
If we did not request the information, ask Lois to call and obtain the missing information as quickly as possible. If we did request the information and it was not provided, treat it as unavailable information.
Use the same rule for answering question about availability of specific materials.

Q-1
Are the assessment devices taken in whole or in part from another device?

No-->Skip to question Q-8 ... 1
Yes->Answer Q-2 through Q-7 . 2

Q-2
Is the other device included in our sample of assessment devices?

Yes-->Fill in number from Miles & Kaufman Directory: ________ .. 1
No, and I do not recognize the other device as one that is widely used. 2
No, but it is based on another device that is widely used (fill in name below) 3

____

Q-3
How much overlap is there between this and the original device?

a) This instrument is exactly the same as the original .... Yes No

b) This instrument uses exactly the same items for all dimensions that it has in common with the original .... Yes No

c) This instrument adds, deletes or modifies items for one or more of the dimensions measured by the original .... Yes No

Q-4
Did you answer "yes" to "c" in the above question?

NO: CIRCLE AND SKIP TO PAGE 3. YES: ANSWER Q-5 THROUGH Q-7

Q-5
Approximately how many items are included in the original measures of the dimensions included in this assessment? (sum across all dimensions)

TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS: ______________________

Q-6
Approximately how many additional items are added in this assessment for those same dimensions?

NUMBER ITEMS ADDED: ______________________

Q-7
Approximately how many of the original items are omitted from this assessment for those same dimensions?

NUMBER ITEMS DELETED: ______________________

Now make a summary judgement about the extent to which this instrument is different from the another included in our sample or in wide use (like the C.F.K. instrument).

If you answered "1" to Q-2 and "a" or "b" to Q-3,
AND if the two instruments do not differ in any other important way (such as recommended uses, scoring of dimensions, etc.), check below and stop coding.

If you answered "1" to Q-2 and "c" to Q-3,
AND the answers to Q-5 through Q-7 imply that the two instruments are largely the same (i.e., 80% or more of the items are in common),
AND if the two instruments do not differ in any other important way (such as recommended uses, scoring of dimensions, etc.), check below and stop coding.

THIS INSTRUMENT IS LARGELY THE SAME AS ANOTHER IN OUR SAMPLE OR
ANOTHER THAT IS WIDELY USED ___________

Q-8
Are self-administered questionnaires used as part of this assessment process?

NO: CIRCLE AND SKIP TO QUESTION Q-11 YES: ANSWER Q-9 AND Q-10

Q-9
For which groups do the materials appear to be intended? (Mark all that apply)

a) Teachers	Yes	No	Cannot tell
b) Students	Yes	No	Cannot tell
c) Principals	Yes	No	Cannot tell
d) Other school staff	Yes	No	Cannot tell
e) Parents	Yes	No	Cannot tell
f) Other	Yes	No	Cannot tell

Use these codes for the next question:

1 Total population
2 Certain classes
3 Probability sample
4 Not specified
5 Other (describe in the space provided)
6 Not applicable

Q-10 What is the primary sampling technique recommended for each questionnaire information source?

	Code for technique	Minimum N recommended
a) Teachers	________	________
b) Students	________	________
c) Parents	________	________

Describe other sampling techniques recommended____________________________

____

Q-11 Are face-to-face interviews used as part of this assessment process?

NO: CIRCLE AND SKIP TO QUESTION Q-15   YES: ANSWER Q-12 THROUGH Q-14

Q-12 For which groups do the materials appear to be intended? (Mark all that apply)

a) Teachers	Yes	No	Cannot tell
b) Students	Yes	No	Cannot tell
c) Principals	Yes	No	Cannot tell
d) Other school staff	Yes	No	Cannot tell
e) Parents	Yes	No	Cannot tell
f) Other	Yes	No	Cannot tell

Use these codes for the next question:

1	Total population
2	Certain classes
3	Probability sample
4	Not specified
5	Other (describe in the space provided)
6	Not applicable

Q-13 What is the primary sampling technique recommended for each interview information source?

	Code for technique	Minimum N recommended
a) Teachers	______	______
b) Students	______	______
c) Parents	______	______

Describe other sampling techniques recommended______________________________

____

Q-14 From among the following list, who would be appropriate interviewers? (circle all that apply)

Professional interviewers	1
Local school staff	2
District staff	3
Researchers	4
Other (who? ______________) .	5

Q-15 Are any other types of data collection used as part of this assessment of school climate? (Do not consider parts of the assessment that summarize data from school records such as achievement test scores, attendance, or discipline)

NO: CIRCLE AND SKIP TO QUESTION Q-17 YES: ANSWER Q-16

Q-16 Describe the data collection procedure

____

____

____

Q-17 Do the instruments appear straightforward and easy for the respondent to follow?

Very easy	1
Somewhat easy	2
Somewhat difficult .	3
Very difficult	4

Q-18 Are there any recommendations for the uses of the assessment information?

NO: CIRCLE AND SKIP TO QUESTION Q-20 YES: ANSWER Q-19

Q-19 Do the materials recommend that the assessment results be used to...

a) Set priorities for the school	Yes	No
b) Set priorities for the district	Yes	No
c) Identify excellent schools	Yes	No
d) Identify poor schools	Yes	No
e) Evaluate programs	Yes	No
f) Other (specify: ______________________________)	Yes	No

Q-20 Written instructions for interpretation of scores are.....

Clear and includes examples	1
Not detailed, but moderately clear .	2
Not clear	3
Not provided	4

Q-21 Written instructions for administering the instruments are.....

Detailed and easy to follow	1
Not detailed, but moderately clear .	2
Not clear	3
Not provided	4

Q-22 Does this instrument appear to be intended for general use?

YES: ANSWER Q-23 AND Q-24 NO: SKIP TO Q-25

Q-23 The name and address (or phone number) of a contact person who can provide assistance in interpreting the results is provided.

True .. 1
False . 2

Q-24 The name and address (or phone number) of a contact person who can consult on the administration of the instruments is provided.

True .. 1
False . 2

Q-25 How can the results be prepared?

a) Hand-scored .... Yes No

b) Machine-scored by a scoring service .... Yes No

c) Machine-scored by a school system .... Yes No

---

Q-26 How long does the assessment take? Fill in "Not applicable" if the group is not assessed. Record the midpoint of the range if a range is given. Use 8.5 items per minute as a benchmark for estimating the time if no estimate is provided. If you use your own estimate for thestudent survey, multiply by three.

Number of minutes

a) Student .... ______

b) Teacher .... ______

c) Principal .... ______

d) Parent .... ______

e) Other(fill in) .... ______

Q-27 How are the results presented?

a) Raw frequencies, means or percentages for the school .... Yes No

b) Percentile ranks for schools .... Yes No

c) Percentile ranks for individuals .... Yes No

d) Expected vs. actual for the school .... Yes No

e) Raw frequencies, means or percentages for subpopulation(s) ... Yes No

f) Percentile ranks for subpopulation(s) .... Yes No

g) Expected vs. actual for subpopulation(s) .... Yes No

h) Profiles .... Yes No

i) Narratives .... Yes No

Q-28 Are the following pieces of technical information provided?

a) Standard deviations .... Yes No

b) Number of cases .... Yes No

c) Standard errors .... Yes No

d) Confidence intervals .... Yes No

e) Other (what? ______________________) .... Yes No

---

Q-29 What reference points are used for comparison with each school's results?

a) None .... Yes No

b) School's own past performance .... Yes No

c) National probability sample .... Yes No

d) National convenience sample .... Yes No

e) Local probability sample .... Yes No

f) Local convenience sample .... Yes No

g) Other (what? ________________) .... Yes No

h) Cannot tell .... Yes No

Q-30 Are the following readily available?

a) Instruments .... Yes No

b) Instructions for interpreting results .... Yes No

c) Instructions for administering instrument .... Yes No

d) References to evaluate reliability and validity of measures .. Yes No

e) Instructions for scoring .... Yes No

---

Q-31 Is information about the cost of the assessment provided? (If no cost information is provided but a phone number for obtaining the information is provided, call the number to obtain the necessary cost information and proceed).

YES: CALCULATE COSTS BELOW AND SKIP TO Q-35 NO: SKIP TO Q-33

Q-32 Calculate how much it would cost to assess a small school of 400 students and 20 teachers, a medium school of 800 students and 40 teachers, and a large school of 1500 students and 75 teachers.

	Cost to assess
a) Small school	________
b) Medium school	________
c) Large school	________

Skip to Q-35

Q-33 Calculate how much it would cost to prepare the data collection instruments to survey a small school of 400 students and 20 teachers, a medium school of 800 students and 40 teachers, and a large school of 1500 students and 75 teachers. Assume 5 cents per page for photocopying.

	Cost to prepare
a) Small school	________
b) Medium school	________
c) Large school	________

Q-34 Calculate how much it would cost to enter the data into a computer in preparation for analysis for a small school of 400 students and 20 teachers, a medium school of 800 students and 40 teachers, and a large school of 1500 students and 75 teachers. Assume 10,500 keystrokes per hour for straightforward numeric data entry, and 8,000 keystrokes per hour for alpha and numeric or for a format that is not straightforward (anything that requires the data entry operator to continually shift eyes, turn pages, etc.). Assume a cost of $1.85 per 1000 keystrokes.

	Cost to enter
a) Small school	______
b) Medium school	______
c) Large school	______

Q-35 Are instruments reuseable?

Yes .	1
No ..	2

Answer questions in next section about each measure and then come back to this last question.

Q-36 Please list the main strengths and weaknesses of this assessment device

Strengths: ____

Weaknesses: ____

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED FOR EACH MEASURE

The following questions apply to each measure in each instrument. Complete this section for each measure. (Attach as many copies as necessary). If the instrument does not have scales, record the number of items here _________, and answer the following questions for the set of items as a whole.

Q-37 What is the name of the measure (or the set of items)?

NAME ______________________________

Q-38 Give a short description of the content of the measure. Be specific: Name each behavior, attitude, condition or characteristic that appears to be included in the set. Include one or more sample items.

Q-39 Does the measure mostly assess a characteristic of...

The environment	1
Individual teachers	2
Individual students	3
Other (what?________________) .	4

Q-40 Who are the respondents for this measure? (circle all that apply)

Students	1
Teachers	2
The principal	3
Other school staff .	4
Parents	5
Other (who?________________)	

Q-41 How many items does the measure have?

NUMBER ________________

Q-42 What is the response format for most items in the measure?

Multiple choice 1
Open-ended 2
Other (what?______________) . 3

Q-43 Is there any evidence about the reliability of this measure?

NO: CIRCLE AND SKIP TO Q-47 YES: ANSWER Q-44 THROUGH Q-46

Q-44 Is the reliability calculated at a level of analysis consistent with the unit of measurement?

Yes 1
No 2
Cannot tell . 3

Q-45 Is there any evidence about the reliability of the measure for different subgroups?

Yes . 1
No .. 2

Q-46 Fill in reliability coefficient.

Write "Not provided" if the type of reliability is not reported.

Reliability coefficient

a) Retest (fill in interval___________) .... ___________

b) Homogeneity .... ___________

Q-47 Does the measure appear to have face validity?

No .. 1
Yes . 2

Q-48 Is there any evidence about the validity of the measure for different subgroups?

Yes . 1
No .. 2

Q-49 What type of validity evidence is provided?

Content validity based on analysis of dimensions of environment or job	1
Convergent/discriminant	2
Experimental	3
Other (name____________________)	4

*****GO BACK TO Q-36 NOW*****

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C: CODING SCHEME USED TO CODE SCALE CONTENT

This classification is primarily from a list of characteristics of effective schools provided by Purkey and Smith (1983). The "effective instruction" category is taken from other literature referenced below and the "frequent monitoring" category is taken from Edmonds (1979).

1. School-site management: Autonomy of the leadership and staff of the school.
2. Instructional leadership: Leadership (by principal or others) to initiate and maintain the improvement process.
3. Staff stability
4. Curriculum articulation and organization: A planned, purposeful program of courses rather than many electives and few requirements. A curriculum that focuses on the skills the school is trying to teach, a school that provides sufficient time for these activities, and coordinates the instruction in these areas across grade levels.
5. Schoolwide staff development: Focused on changing people's attitudes and behaviors as well as their skills and techniques. Closely related to the school program, incremental, long-term, and based on teacher-perceived needs.
6. Parental involvement and support: Informing parents of school goals, student responsibilities, especially with regard to homework. Obtaining parental support.
7. Schoolwide recognition of academic success: Ceremonies and symbols related to academic accomplishments. Public honoring of academic accomplishments.
8. Maximized learning time: Allocated and engaged. Instructional time guarded, few disturbances, staff development in classroom management.
9. District support: Guiding and helping schools improve.
10. Frequent monitoring of student progress and feedback: A system for frequently assessing student performance and achievement, and the use of data to frequently assess progress and provide students with feedback about their progress.
11. Effective instruction--This category included more detailed characteristics of effective instruction identified in the literature (Anderson, Evertson & Brophy, 1979; Good & Grouws, 1979) but not explicitly addressed in the "effective schools literature." It included questioning strategies, teacher-led instruction, teacher practices to ensure high success rates, student participation, monitoring during seatwork, explicit criteria for evaluating student progress . . . .
12. Collaborative planning and collegial relationships: Teachers and administrators working together.
13. Sense of community: A sense of being a recognized member of a community that is supportive and clearly perceived--reduced alienation.
14. Clear goals and high expectations commonly shared: Reaching consensus on the school's goals and expectations, continual monitoring of pupil and classroom progress.
15. Order and discipline: Clear, reasonable rules enforced consistently, safety quiet, orderliness.